THE FORUM

AUGUST 1923

HOW TO STABILIZE CONSTRUCTION

By NOBLE FOSTER HOGGSON

TWENTY-TWO per cent of our workers are engaged in construction. Conditions which affect any one department of the construction industry, indirectly influence every other. The need of co-ordination and stabilization on a vast scale is obvious. To accomplish this is the hope of the American Construction Council, which was established in June, 1922. Mr. Noble Foster Hoggson is Chairman of its Executive Committee.

CONSTRUCTION may well be termed the big tool of civilization. In Turkestan, on the site of the prehistoric city of Anau, were recently uncovered ancient building materials twelve thousand years old. Five thousand years ago Egypt faced her labor problems when Moses led his brick makers to the Promised Land. Rome added to her fame by building roads which still endure. Roman aqueducts and arenas remain today as examples of a civilization two thousand years old. Construction has ever been the best means of expressing the basic impulse underlying civilization.

The advancement of science in our present age has exerted its influence on construction. The skyline of New York, the subways that honeycomb the earth beneath these marvels, the bridges that unite a city having great rivers within its confines; what awe these inspire! Everywhere the spirit of the Builder hovers over the earth.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So vital is construction to the well-being of man, so interwoven with all progress, that the success of the American Construction Council should concern everyone. Its program of voluntary co-operation led Herbert Hoover to characterize the movement as the most important ever undertaken in our industrial history. The farm building, the factory, the school, the statehouse, and the home, all are construction's contribution to civilization. Add the roadway, the bridge, transportation systems, docks, and dams, and the field of operations is barely revealed. Visualize the countless sources of raw material, the various stages of manufacture, the innumerable operations involved in so everyday an operation as pouring a reinforced concrete beam!

Construction in the United States today is one of the great factors of permanent national wealth. It is second only to agriculture in point of the yearly volume of dollars involved and is really entitled to first place when measured by the number of men who are dependent upon the construction industries for a livelihood. It is computed that the number of workers who with their families derive their support from the construction groups totals more than eleven million persons, or about ten per cent of the population of our country.

The importance of the construction industry and the necessity for official education in recognition of its pre-eminence were forcibly brought out in the summer of 1922 when the Interstate Commerce Commission allocated freight cars to the coal industry primarily with a view to the nation's warmth. More than three thousand protests were made, including that of the construction industry. Under the order approximately eighteen thousand cars would have been available for the large construction program then on hand.

It was shown to the Commission that such a ruling would stop construction through lack of transportation of essential materials, imperil the well being of millions of workers, and tend greatly to increase the army of unemployed during the approaching winter months. As a result the order was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amended so that thirty-four thousand additional cars were allotted to construction activities. Even this total of fifty-two thousand cars was only one-third the number actually needed.

Thus from many angles construction would seem to be the barometer of our industrial life. When depression strikes construction it rocks the whole structure and "good times" are rapidly supplanted by "hard times." When in the course of events the tide turns, construction is the first to be carried on the rising flood, and other industries follow in its wake. It is manifestly desirable, therefore, that a better understanding of the construction industry and of general conditions surrounding it be brought about at the earliest possible moment, in order to lay the foundation upon which more satisfactory industrial conditions can be built.

No discussion of construction is complete today without some reference to the high cost of building. When we speak of high cost we should not overlook the fact that the demands for modern conveniences are greater than ever before. Improved ventilation systems, increased light, improved plumbing, heating systems, speedy elevator accommodation, mail chutes, acoustics, ice cold drinking water, all make comparison with older standards inequitable.

Further than this, the protective fire and safety laws have compelled a good deal of additional cost. At the same time they permit to some extent a more economical use of materials,—for example, arches of longer span, iron and steel of the same strength but less weight, steel beams and girders requiring less fitting and assembly on the job, concrete plastering, hollow tile partitions, and mechanical loading devices.

What should concern us at this time is not entirely how cheaply we can build, but rather that we should build for endurance. In times past we did not always build for permanence; it was more frequently to serve an immediate need. We have nowhere approached the real economy of substantial permanent building. Today I think we might safely say that we are only really building the city of Wash-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ington. Unquestionably the cities of Athens and Rome were built for a greater degree of permanence than the capital of our own country. Probably in no other country has such an immense quantity of highly speculative building been done. This was bound to affect the quality.

I agree with Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University, who says that the recently increased cost of home building has had a more deleterious influence on the American mode of living than any other change which has taken place since the opening of the twentieth century, and *that the whole remedial process of relieving the situation must be one of public education.*

As a practical application of these ideas and as indicative of how the well prepared organization interprets conditions to advantage, let us consider typical cases in recent building operations. For a long time the Hotel Statler Company planned to erect a hotel in Buffalo. A new home of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York was decided upon. The great Lorillard Tobacco Company needed a new factory on the outskirts of New York City. These contemplated structures represented three different classes of building: the residential group, the business group, and the industrial group. Combined, the operations represent several millions of dollars of permanent wealth.

But the men behind these enterprises are men of sound judgment. Facts are carefully studied by them. No small detail in any program is overlooked. Therefore, although for some time the architectural plans were ready for all these buildings, actual construction was deferred as long as cost levels indicated a tendency to rise or even to maintain high levels. About August-September, 1921, it was decided that the period of ultimate low-cost levels had been reached and contracts were accordingly let for the buildings. Construction was undertaken at once. The judgment that dictated this policy was sustained when shortly thereafter the upward swing developed and continued unbroken.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By taking advantage of favorable conditions many dollars were saved the owners.

The idea to be fixed in mind here is that these buildings could wait. They were in the class which could be carried over from the period of peak construction, to fill up the valleys. If this were more generally done the graphic curve of construction would be more nearly level at all times, indicating regularity instead of ups and downs.

It was such practice that the American Construction Council had in mind when at its recent general session it recommended deferment of building which was not imperatively required. In the face of labor and material shortage, with an accompanying high-cost level, the volume of contemplated building was augmented by much that could be deferred without inconvenience until a later period, when material and labor would be more available as a result of decline in volume of construction required.

This deferable construction could readily be carried over from the prevailing peak period to a future valley period with advantage to everyone. It is the very heart of such a recommendation that deferment is not for an indefinite period but merely until a more favorable period, when instead of aggravating the situation, the deferred construction would be a welcome influx of demand.

That the American Construction Council is a corrective for all the ills and ails that beset business and social relations today, not even its most ardent supporter would maintain. Without in the least degree minimizing the magnitude of the field of interrelated industries which it seeks to co-ordinate and improve, it may be remarked that the ideals and principles to which the Council is dedicated are universally accepted in our personal standards of conduct or judgment. A sense of the importance of co-operation increases daily in every sphere of human effort. Great principles which were once merely preached have now passed into daily practice. From this we take heart and draw encouragement for the future.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The American Construction Council was conceived as a means of eliminating waste in time, effort, and money, resulting from the non-correlated activity of the component parts of the construction industry. Identification of the numerous industries comprehended under the general head of construction is sought, not only in public and official thought but in unification of actual operation.

In its organization the Council embraces the following groups, each with equal voting power: engineers, architects, construction labor, general contractors, sub-contractors, material and equipment manufacturers, material and equipment dealers, bond, insurance, and real estate interests, and the various construction departments of public utilities. It also includes officials of state, municipal, and federal departments identified in any way with construction.

For present purposes, the activities of the Council have been divided into two, though not mutually exclusive, groups: first, the immediate or emergency program, and second, the ultimate program.

With regard to the first or emergency program, among the more important activities are to be: a national program on apprentice-training; comprehensive steps toward the determination of the causes and the elimination of waste in all its phases throughout the industry, including a survey of costs; promotion of the stability of employment and the reduction of unemployment; a general educational program as to the problems of the industry and its development, and the promotion of the concept of construction activities as a great American industry.

With regard to a permanent program, it is expected that in addition to developing the emergency activities into definite form, the Council will give attention to such matters as: articulation of transportation, production, and distribution facilities with the needs of the construction industry; promotion of a better quality of construction, especially in housing; industrial arbitration other than labor disputes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(possibly adjudication of labor disputes can ultimately develop); development of responsibility, legal and moral, among all elements within the industry as, for example, in trade agreements, speculative loan associations, and contracts for material; the practical and sane interpretation of the anti-trust laws as related to the operation of industry.

The Council has no quarrel with the desire of labor to better its income, to secure a maximum return for skilled work or industrious application. But speaking entirely for myself I would express the Council's attitude in the words of John Ruskin, patron essayist of construction, who says in *Modern Painters*: "No amount of pay ever made a good soldier, a good teacher, a good artist, or a good workman. . . . Nothing good can be accomplished without intense feeling. . . . All great men not only know their business but usually know that they know it, only they do not think too much of themselves on that account."

Ancient masons, probably the Chinese, were the inventors of the level, the plane, the square, and the compass. These implements have been of immense value in the development of architectural advancement. The permanency of their work is evidenced in the Great Wall of China as it stands today after thousands of years. If the industrial slaves of the Orient could erect structures that would stand as monuments to their skill throughout the centuries, surely our building craftsmen should be imbued with sufficient pride in the work of their hands to render their best, to refuse to countenance limited output and shoddy craftsmanship.

A brief comment on the effect of limited immigration on construction activities might well be introduced here. At present the labor shortage, accompanied by rising labor costs, is very marked in the building trades. In considering what has brought about a labor shortage, after two years of unemployment, attention is focused on many factors: the return of industrial workers to the farms, the tremendous demand for manufactured products after the complete exhaustion of reserve stocks during depression, fulfilment of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deferred demands caused by the war and suppressed during periods of depression, the decreased productiveness of American labor, and the restriction of immigration.

The total of aliens admitted for the past twelvemonth was 88,250. There was an actual loss of 10,000 males, as the surplus of immigrants coming in over emigrants going back was entirely in women and children. In theory the three per cent restriction law contemplated annual admission of 360,000 persons. In actual operation, admissions are below this because many countries do not send their full quota.

At the same time those who desire to leave from other countries are greatly in excess of the allowable quota for those countries. No provision in the law permits of balancing deficits in one quota against excess in another. The final outcome is that only eleven per cent instead of forty-five per cent of the normal population influx of former years is now admitted to the United States.

We are, then, facing a new era of prosperity with a diminishing labor supply instead of an increasing one, so far as drawing from foreign countries is concerned. The importance of developing our native man-power is, therefore, again emphasized. In construction alone we need approximately thirty-five thousand new skilled workers and twelve thousand additional common laborers annually, to replace those lost by death, retirement, and other causes.

If we deduct construction employes from the entire mechanical and manufacturing groups of the country, as classified by the United States Census Bureau, we find that construction employs twenty-two per cent of all skilled and common labor. From this we determine that not less than 214,000 new laborers and skilled workmen are required every year for replacement in all industries.

It is common knowledge that the ability of certain racial groups to pass our literacy test admits a preponderance of the clerical and small trader or merchant class. The common manual laborer of Europe is rarely able to read and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

write. The result of the literacy test in practice, therefore, is to admit women and children and those having the elements of a mental education but physically unqualified for productive labor.

Assuredly no man having the future of America at heart wishes to see his country inundated by a tide of European conglomerates. But there is an immense abundance of skilled labor,—carpenters, masons, iron workers, and kindred trades,—and a surplus of able-bodied common labor, in certain countries of Europe, whose blood lines are not different from our own. It is from the Scottish, English, Irish, German, and Scandinavian countries that we could obtain the men we require.

Periods of prosperity and periods of depression are determined principally by the amount of manufacturing and construction occurring within the period. More definitely, depression is a decrease in production of real, permanent wealth such as buildings, railways, ships, goods, metals, ores. The decrease in production of such tangible wealth, as differentiated from money or gold which is merely representative wealth, is not the result of lack of power to buy or lack of desire to acquire, *but of a widespread refusal to buy at the high prices that prevail.* Anything may be sold or constructed at any time if selling prices are low enough to assure reasonable expectation of profit.

Past experience shows that the period of depression in manufacturing and construction has always developed when prices were superlatively high, prosperity at its peak, and reserve stocks of materials near to exhaustion. It is these circumstances which invite the recurring evil called cycles of depression. So sure are the signs, that economists feel justified in forecasting such developments and attempting to measure the regularity of the cyclical periods. How absurd that, knowing the signs of impending depression, no united effort has ever been made by industry to eliminate the cause of the depression.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Instead of regarding a temporary surplus as a hazard it should be recognized that orderly accumulation of a temporary surplus is the sure and only way to create regularity of production and uninterrupted good times through regularity of supplies and prices. Such intelligent and legitimate methods of distribution and accumulation have been advantageously applied to perishable produce such as eggs, butter, and beef. This brings regularity of supply to meet a constant demand, although regularity of production varies. When the construction industry applies the principle of dealing intelligently with a temporary surplus there will be no more over-production of any material or labor nor any difficulty in meeting a demand for construction projects.

Concurrent stability in prices will give greater wealth to producers of coal, lumber, cement, steel, tin, copper, lead, and countless other building materials. And it is important to note that money made in this way imposes hardship on no one. Employment in what would otherwise be dull years is given to those who would have been idle, and when stocks are sold in a period of demand the owners secure a profit and the public is protected against extreme high prices.

The American Construction Council hopes that it will be able to disseminate such information and encourage application of such basic economic principles as will make it possible greatly to increase our national wealth. No industrial country can hope to progress by pursuing a policy of decreasing production. The poorest nation and the richest nation differ only in conditions natural to difference in productive capacity. Idleness is a permanent and irreparable loss. It is inexcusable. When workers cannot secure employment, something is out of order somewhere. The Construction Council hopes to be able to determine the why and wherefore in such a situation and through economic and industrial education bring about elimination of such conditions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Permanent building is the only economical method. We hear much about the high cost of building and the question is asked, "when is it going to be cheaper to build?" Building is not going to be cheap again in the pre-war sense of omitting many improvements and conveniences. It would not be a sign of progress if it were, but rather the reverse. However, much certainly can be done to eliminate the peaks and valleys in construction, which have brought about the present serious condition of high-cost levels.

To this end the Council is establishing in New York City a well-organized bureau of statistics and business information for distribution of all facts relative to raw materials, fabricated products, transportation, wholesale and retail distribution of stocks and labor items. It will issue a "Construction Forecast" for distribution to all interested factors and to the daily press, indicating approximate demand for labor and material for several months in advance. These reports in time should be as conclusive in guiding construction programs as current crop reports and anticipations are in guiding the interests connected with farm products and finance.

Such authentic information will enable all interested parties to determine on the best time to proceed with a building operation. It will have a restraining influence on speculative building, as the bankers and financial interests of the country will be in a position to know the real facts of the construction market and will not lend money during unfavorable times.

One of the leading manufacturers supplying the construction industry has just published a special discount sheet for deliveries in what might have been termed "off season" times. Such a practice is highly beneficial to the public and is one of the most practical steps toward elimination of seasonal unemployment. The transportation of these commodities in "off times" is equivalent to adding just that volume to the country's railroad transportation and means

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a continuous use of freight cars, all of which reacts decidedly to the advantage of the whole public.

The important work which the American Construction Council has undertaken has the hearty endorsement of thoughtful men throughout the country. It is everywhere conceded that one of the causes of present day unrest is attributable to public misunderstanding of economic reactions affecting modern business. This lack of understanding is not limited to any class. Everyone, irrespective of position, must be brought to a realization that all industry is so interwoven that injury cannot be done to any part without injuring all. Teamwork and intelligent co-operation for construction must supplant chaotic destruction. With the full support of those who can visualize a better and more prosperous epoch in American industrial life, the American Construction Council will do more than its share in bringing about such an epoch.

MORNING

By J. Corson Miller

These three things hold me
When the day wakes up:
The sun that spills gold lava
In a turquoise cup;

A giant oak that lifts
Proud, emerald spires
Above the molten rose
Of morning fires;

A broad-winged mountain-eagle,
Circling in a distant ring,
With all the sullen sweep
Of a vandal-king.

These three things hold me,
When the dawn leaps high:
The sun, the oak, and an eagle riding
A windy sky.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT LABOR ASKS OF THE CHURCH

By PAUL BLANSHARD

A TRADE union officer who, as a worker in the garment factories, has taken part in many battles for the rights of labor, believes that the Church should raise its voice to denounce low wages, long hours and economic inequality. He asks that the Church ascertain and proclaim the truth about industrial conditions, and proposes three new commandments for Christian employers.

THE typical sermon on Capital and Labor runs something like this: Capitalists are often Godless men lacking personal faith and Christian virtue. Laborers are often controlled by dangerous foreign agitators. Capital and Labor must stop this dreadful fighting and get together in Christian love.

The labor leader who hears this kind of sermon exclaims: "Rot! The church is preaching sentimental nonsense. Why don't the preachers say something?"

The labor leader's opinions are confirmed when he reads utterances such as those of Mr. Gary of the United States Steel Corporation, who declared before the Iron and Steel Institute recently that he wanted the principles of Christianity applied to American life. Then he announced that the twelve-hour day must be continued in the steel industry. Many a worker who read that utterance remarked: "If that is Christianity, where do I come in?"

No one can speak for all American labor in regard to any subject, least of all religion. There are as many attitudes toward the church as there are workers. The labor movement is made up of good Catholics, good Jews, indifferent Protestants, Bolsheviks, Southern Presbyterians, and infidels. The religious issue rarely arises in the affairs of the average union except when some employer tries to play one group of workers against another in time of strike, as for example, the Irish Catholics against the Jews. The workers do not ordinarily think of their movement as having anything to do with the church. It is neither hostile nor loyal. It is simply detached.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevertheless there is a profound and important connection between the church and the labor movement. The church looks at the world and declares it is evil. We of the labor organizations look at the world and declare it is evil. The church says that the world needs love, brotherhood, faith. We look at the world and say, "Yes, the world needs faith, love, and brotherhood, but you cannot have these things without some specific improvements in our economic affairs. We want to destroy certain important evils in society."

What has the church to do with those evils? Simply this. Labor believes that the church must fight those evils or be untrue to its trust. We want certain things because we consider them the most vital things in life. We will regard the church as a friend if it helps us to get them; we will regard the church as an enemy if it opposes us in the struggle, or if it tries to maintain a neutral attitude. Our attitude toward the church depends upon the church's attitude toward the great problems which we face.

First, there is the inequality of wealth. Why should some workers in America starve while some idlers in America eat? Why should there be a Fifth Avenue and an East Side. Do the people on Fifth Avenue need more money? If so, why?

America has become known as a country of millionaires, but the workers are not getting an increased share in its prosperity. Recent statistical studies reviewed by George Soule show that the real wages of American workers were less in 1919 than in 1899. The people who talk about labor's silk shirts and automobiles are usually the people who would never dream of living on an American worker's average wage.

The appalling facts of low wages in the factories and mines of America have been revealed by almost every official investigation. The Interchurch World Movement registered that seventy-two per cent of the steel strikers in the last great strike received less than a minimum-of-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comfort wage. The Federal Industrial Relations Commission estimated that far more than half of our workers do not receive enough for food, clothes, shelter, and old age. This in the country of Newport and Palm Beach!

Then, there is the degradation of personality which accompanies the industrial system. We are often accused of being materialists because we fight for a dollar an hour. But what does a dollar an hour mean to us? It means decent teeth, good milk for the children, the best doctor when the baby comes, and an occasional suit of clothes. It means that the children have some chance of going to high school, but not to college; it means that once in two or three years we have a vacation. It means a few magazines and a victrola. It means forty-four dollars a week if we have an eight-hour day. It means that we may go to the poor-house when we are old if we get fired.

These are the human things for which we fight in the labor movement: we fight for money because money means more abundant life. We fight a losing battle in the richest country in the world because we are worth less as the years go on. Our human machines run down and the employers pay nothing for junk.

We fight against the monotony of the machine process and the long hours of uninspiring work. The twelve-hour day has attained great publicity and it has received the denunciation of many distinguished reactionaries as well as liberals. It deserves that denunciation; it is the most inhuman fact in our industrial life. But it should not be allowed to obscure the other inhuman fact, the machine process itself. In almost every industry the workers are being reduced to the level of gear shifts, oil cups, and automatic stitchers. Our work is as glorious as the crank of a phonograph.

There is but one sound method of relief from that burden of monotony and strain: it is the short work-day. We cannot go back to the days of the all-round artisan because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would cost too much. The suit of clothes that is made by a hundred and fifty people is usually better and cheaper than the suit formerly made by an all-round tailor. The worker has been degraded in the process from a tailor to a seam presser or a button sewer, but the product has been improved and cheapened.

We fight against the autocratic control of our industrial system by investors. One man sitting at a desk in New York may control the destinies of a hundred thousand men who go down into the mines every day and crawl for half a mile in the dark. The man in New York may know nothing about mining. We say that that is neither democratic nor just. The walls of the factories do not belong to us; we go in to work at another man's machine. The investors who put their money into the concern are called "the company." We are bought and sold like cakes of soap and sacks of flour.

The employer often tells us what unions we can belong to or whether we can belong at all. We must bargain with his union, the corporation. He often refuses to bargain with ours. We do not tell him that he cannot join the National Association of Manufacturers because it is dangerously reactionary; but he sometimes tells us that we cannot join the United Mine Workers or the I. W. W. because they are radical. He launches an open shop movement to defend the freedom of the strike-breaker. We are more interested in our own freedom. The employer can hire us and fire us at will, unless we have a powerful union. We cannot fire him, not even Mr. Gary.

In our struggle for collective bargaining and the union shop the law is often against us. I have been in strikes in which union meetings have been broken up, union organizers deported out of the city by the police without any warrant or arrest, and others put in jail without a trial by jury. The judges may be honorable men, but they are usually corporation lawyers who have thought from the corporation point of view all their lives. They could not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

live on a worker's wage but they are sure that we can. They use the injunction against us in such a way that a strike can be broken and its leaders put in jail without a jury trial.

Some churchman who reads this article will say: "Yes, we know these things and we protest against them."

Do you? Where? How loudly do you protest? How many buts and ifs and ands are attached to the denunciation? We recognize that the neutral attitude is advisable in investigating industrial facts, but the attitude should not continue after the facts have been disclosed. We feel that the church should be just as militant in its opposition to industrial ills as it was in its fight against negro slavery or the saloon. Why play safe? Jesus didn't.

We feel that the church is now largely controlled by business men. This is not the fault of the business men nor primarily of the church. It is simply a reflection of the social inequality in which we live. Business men have a chance to learn the lessons of executive management; workers have not. Business men have surplus money for supporting the church; workers have less. Business men may be personally kind and honest (they have a better chance to be good than the workers), but their prejudices are in favor of the current economic habits that give wealth and social standing to the people who own and manipulate, and a bare subsistence to the people who produce.

What do we think the church ought to do about it? I must repeat that labor as a whole has no opinion in the matter, because there is no such thing as "labor as a whole." But from my four years of experience as a trade union officer I would say that we want these things:

First of all we would like to have constant denunciation by preachers and church leaders of low wages, long hours, of the denial of real collective bargaining and the economic inequality of our society. This would imply a new set of social-moral ideals. The old decalogue is individualistic. "Thou shalt not steal" is an incomplete commandment, especially when applied to the grandson

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the man who stole. We suggest certain additions:

Thou shalt not discharge a man for being a radical.

Thou shalt not pay workers a starvation wage if thou hast any gasoline in thy tank.

Thou shalt not use the name of Christ in vain by mentioning Him in the same speech with the twelve-hour day.

Secondly, we believe that the church is well situated to make fact-studies of modern industrial situations and report to the public the truth that is disclosed. The preacher is not usually a statistical expert, but the church can easily hire such. If the task of fact-finding is left to business men alone, the concern for human welfare is likely to be subordinated. The moral ideals of the church could not be expressed in any better way than in such a magnificent study as the Interchurch World Movement's Report on the Steel Strike. That report is an indication of what the church might do for other great industrial struggles. It contained a few minor errors, but its central indictment remains unshaken.

And, as a third request, we want the church to give us some great personalities like the late Bishop Williams of Michigan. The British labor movement has hundreds of local and national leaders who are nurtured in the church. Labor is not standing with open arms to receive the churchman as a churchman, but it is more than willing to fight with any man who fights as a worker.

The moral earnestness of the search for ultimate things is found in both the church and the labor movement. Through the social service commissions of the churches, the two movements are beginning to overlap. In the church are a few men who have the economic ideal of the labor movement; in the unions are a few men who have the moral idealism of the church. In religious belief the two will never come together, but in emancipating the workers from this present, evil world the most enlightened sections of the church and the labor movement have a co-operating future, a future of pain and opportunity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD LABOR

By WILLIAM PALMER LADD

THAT enlightened churchmen are prepared to take up the challenge of Labor, as thrown down by the author of the preceding article, is implied by Dean Ladd, who explains why Christianity cannot afford to ignore the ethical and sociological problems of the day.

THE Church's attitude toward labor is becoming a subject of interest to many both within and without the Church, and of keen apprehension to some. The publication of the Inter-Church Report on the steel strike revealed to the country what an influence for good or evil the Church might exercise, when it chose, in the field of industrial reform. The clergy have in recent months been deluged with literature of a propaganda character both for and against the claims of labor. Many who belong to the propertied or employing classes are stirred over what they consider radical tendencies in the Church; while the laboring man shows his disapproval of what he considers the Church's prejudiced or lukewarm attitude toward his aspirations by standing aloof for the most part from all forms of organized religion. Within the Church there is a wide difference of opinion among both clergy and laity as to what should be the policy of the Church toward the labor problem.

There is an obvious but deceptive way out of all difficulties,—to decide that the Church ought not to have any attitude whatever toward the labor movement. Those who hold this view believe that the Church's duty toward labor is fulfilled when it receives the laboring man to the privileges of its membership on exactly the same terms it offers to other men; that the Church should keep aloof from all economic disputes, and concern itself with men's spiritual needs only. They believe that the clergy should con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fine themselves to preaching what is sometimes called the old-fashioned gospel, administering the ordinances of religion, and giving pastoral care to the comfortless, the sick, and the dying; and that they should leave business men to carry on their affairs according to the standards of the business world.

Everyone is familiar with such or similar opinions. What they really imply is that the Church should keep out of the field of ethics, for it is impossible for the Church to concern itself with the ethics of the individual without getting into the sphere of his conduct as a member of society. But for the Church to abandon its function as an ethical teacher would be for it to break with the whole Christian tradition. The Christianity of the western world in particular has been distinguished for its emphasis upon conduct. Its glory has been that it has been a practical religion. Not invariably with success yet always it has greatly dared to play a part in the rough and tumble of human affairs. It is not likely Christianity will turn back from such a tradition to a form of Oriental mysticism. Moreover, a religion that is non-ethical is certain, sooner or later, to become immoral.

Few will maintain that the Church ought definitely or officially to ally itself with labor or with any other social, economic, or political group. But that it should stand aloof from every social problem is quite another matter. The Church is not likely to get a hearing for a non-ethical gospel. Nor will it gain hearers for a timid proclamation of the truth. Rather will the approval of all serious-minded men go out to a Church which is attempting, even if it sometimes fail, to use its influence in any helpful way for the elimination of social strife and the establishment of a reformed social order.

A glance at the history of the Christian Church will show that it has from the beginning concerned itself with social betterment. This was notably true in the Middle Ages when its authority was more widely acknowledged than at any other period in its history. No one then imagined that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Church ought to be ruled out of the field of social and economic problems. Mother Church with one hand pointed her children toward a future heaven and hell, but with the other she gave them firm and thoughtful guidance in their everyday business of buying and selling, spending and saving according to the Christian rule. There was an orthodox system of business ethics as well as an orthodox theological doctrine. The greatest theologian of the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas, was also the greatest economist of his age. Questions about monopoly, speculation, rates of interest, fair prices, wages, and hours of labor came within the cognizance of the Church. Economics was a recognized department of ethics, as ethics was of theology.

The passing of the authority of the Church in the sphere of social ethics was not simply due to the loss of prestige which it suffered in the sectarian strife of the reformation period. It was still more due to the fact that the Church at the end of the Middle Ages found itself, as it still finds itself, face to face with a social order immeasurably more complex than that of any previous age. City life with all its problems of wealth and poverty, squalor and beauty, health and disease, has replaced the simple country life which in the Middle Ages gave its character to the social order. The aggregation of wealth has taken the instruments of power and the opportunity for its unfair use out of the hands of the feudal lord and placed it in the hands of the organizer of industry, the trader, the banker, the shareholder, who, as a rule, build no castles and do not know their subjects nor are known of them. Manufacture by hand has been superseded by the factory system; the oxcart and the sailing ship have been replaced by steam and electric means of transportation, and the increasing application of science to industry has transformed not only the whole material basis of our civilization but our arts and philosophies as well.

In the face of this new social order and in the midst of the new problems of enormous complexity created by it, it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hardly to be expected that the Church should have worked out any clean-cut and consistent ethical program. It could hardly have retained its ancient authority in the sphere of social ethics. And from one point of view it was fortunate that it had so little ambition to do so. Any official or semi-official pronouncement would have been either an attempt to apply old answers to new problems or a crude assumption of knowledge it did not possess. The Christian may perhaps be thankful that the Churches of the reformation period were more concerned with doctrinal than with ethical questions.

He may with even more reason be thankful that in the eighteenth century the Churches did not commit themselves to the ethical and economic doctrines so widely prevailing among members of the Churches. At the end of the eighteenth century, coincident in part with our American revolution and enormously more important in its influence on our lives though it does not so figure in the school histories, came the industrial revolution in England. It manifested in their acutest form those baffling social problems which have been produced in the transition from the medieval to the modern industrial order.

At that time William Wilberforce, who fought so nobly for the emancipation of the black slaves, was the leading evangelical layman of the Church of England. He it was who was chiefly responsible for the Combination Act, an act which remained on the Statute books of England for a quarter of a century, under which any workman who combined with another in order to get an increase of wages or a decrease of hours might be sent for three months to jail. Contemporary with Wilberforce was the famous English clergyman, Malthus, who thought that to relieve poverty was to increase it, and Dr. William Paley, also a noted Church of England divine, who wrote a pamphlet entitled "Reasons for Contentment Addressed to the Laboring Part of the British Public," in which he attempted to prove that poverty is a pleasure rather than a hardship.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One can imagine what might have been the result if the Churches of that day had undertaken to make a report on conditions existing among the operatives in the cotton mills of Lancashire, and to present its findings to the British public. Such a report might have reflected the views of the "best minds" of that day, the Wilberforces and Paleys, or it might have done even worse and expressed the prejudices of the *nouveaux riches,* the exploiters of child labor, the profiteers whose influence was so dominant in England at that time. In any case it would hardly have been a document which would have drawn the fire of the very people who needed to be rebuked. Nor would it have been a document which the Churchmen of to-day could read with pride. It was better for the Church to have followed, as it did, a do-nothing policy.

Before leaving this aspect of the subject it may be well to recall the fact that the complexity of modern social and industrial order has created a problem not only for the Church but for society as a whole, and a problem for which society as well as the Church has not as yet found a solution. Our material development has outrun our thinking. How to integrate the political and the industrial order is the statesman's greatest problem. How to escape from a machinery-ridden world, or rather how to spiritualize that world, is the problem of humanity, and not only of the Church.

But for the resolution of this problem of humanity the Church must do its share. It cannot be expected to have, and it does not have, ready made answers to all religious and ethical questions. It must think out the problems of Christian living for every new age, and it must find ever new answers for both new and old questions. It must learn from the past but it should live up to its best, not its worst traditions. And it must not fix its eyes on the past, whether that past be of the first century or the thirteenth, in such a way that it has no perception of the needs of today. It must study the past and the present that it may have a vision of a better

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

future and may work for that future in cooperation with all men of good will of whatever creed.

There is increasing dissatisfaction with the do-nothing tradition. The Church cannot live and thrive on a merely negative program. Between the blind, destructive economic forces of the present day on the one hand and the awakening spiritual aspirations on the other, the Church cannot take a merely non-committal attitude, or if it do so it may well suffer a still further loss of influence. There are certainly some helpful things it may do with reference to the labor problem. I venture to make several simple and, I fear, old-fashioned suggestions.

First, the Church can encourage in its members an intelligent attitude toward labor. The indifference of so many Churchmen to the labor problem is a part of the general indifference of educated people to all economic subjects. The science of economics has only recently won any recognition in our traditional school and college curriculum. Our fathers did not consider it a part of the training of the gentleman that he should know too much about the world in which he was to live. They thought it better that their children should spend their school and college years in learning how Xenophon's soldiers foraged for food rather than in acquiring any knowledge of such things as malnutrition or real wages among the day laborers of the present day; better that they should be familiar with the conspiracy of Catiline than with the theories of Karl Marx; better to know the ins and outs of the feudal than of the industrial system. And as for the student of theology it is even yet considered more essential that he should know Hebrew and Greek than that he should know the elementary facts about industrial history or the prevailing industrial system of the world.

It is not to be wondered at if a Church whose members have been educated in the linguistic tradition should be somewhat at sea in dealing with the labor problem. And a Church in which neither clergy nor laity have reached any well-informed or carefully considered convictions on eco-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic questions is seriously handicapped in any desire it may have to be helpful either to the laboring man or the employer in pressing on them a Christian solution of the labor problem. If one is to teach one must first of all go to school, and this principle applies even to a teaching Church. Even if it have a divine revelation in its possession it can hardly make that revelation effective unless it proclaim it in the language of its hearers, and can apply its eternal truth to the changing needs and problems of an actual world. The Church authority which in our day is likely to carry most weight is that which is rooted in reason and illumined with adequate knowledge.

It would be absurd to expect of the average Church member, whether of the clergy or the laity, any expert knowledge of economic science. But men do not spurn all knowledge of the law of health because they are not trained in medicine. Some general knowledge of medicine is an almost essential part of the equipment of the educated man. Such knowledge in the economic field may guide the practical judgment of the Christian and save him from egregious blunders, as it will certainly extend his sympathies. This clarity of judgment and quickness of sympathy are essential for that moral discernment which the labor problem demands.

Christian principles require, above all, that the attitude of the student of economic questions should be open-minded and honest. He should avoid prejudice and partisanship. He should be suspicious of propaganda. And he should seek his knowledge elsewhere than in printed pages. If he is in earnest he will go to the sources of information. He will want to know how the other half lives and works. It might well be the ambition of every Church member to seek the friendship of some labor leader. And congregations might well request of those who have the ordering of their services that more frequent opportunity than at present be given them of hearing labor tell its own story rather than that they be left to gather their knowledge of the labor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement from ill-informed or prejudiced sources of information. Where there is a difference of opinion the employer should of course have an equal opportunity of putting his side of the case before the churches.

Secondly, the Church must insistently preach the necessity of reason and reasonableness if any progress is to be made toward the solution of the labor problem. The alternative to reason is emotion, sentiment, and, in the end, violence. Violence is an acknowledged evil. It poisons social as it does individual life. It cannot help either labor, or capital, or society. Sentiment and emotion divorced from reason are almost equally mischievous. They can solve no problem. Only on the field of reason can all differences be squarely met and progress made toward their reconciliation. The problem is to persuade all parties to meet on this fair and open field.

The modern world has come to associate reason with science and law rather than with religion, and has been inclined to relegate the activity of the Church to the sphere of the sentiments and emotions. But, as a matter of fact, there are few traditions more closely woven into the whole history of the Christian Church than its insistence on the absolute character and claim of reason. The Old Testament is full of the praise of wisdom,—which is reason applied to human welfare. In the New Testament Jesus Christ is called the incarnate reason. Around the idea of the logos, reason, the early Church fathers built that theological structure which is still the doctrine of all the churches. Among the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages enthusiasm for reason was as much to the fore as among modern scientists. The sectarian strife of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries may have obscured the claims of reason for a time, but the whole drift of modern theology has been to reassert these claims. The Church then seems to have earned the right to urge the necessity of reason. And just because it can link reason with emotion and sentiment and with that authority which religion furnishes, it would seem to be in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a stronger position for making the claims of reason effective among the people at large than either the scientist or the jurist.

In its advocacy of reason and reasonableness the Church will doubtless have the support of men of all shades of opinion. Yet it is perhaps the duty of the Church to urge the importance of reason upon the employing class rather than upon those in the ranks of labor. Not that violence is not as reprehensible in the one as in the other class. The preacher who rebukes labor, however, is not likely to be preaching to the culprit. But it is to be feared that there are usually among the regular occupants of the pews of many Christian churches some prosperous people of both sexes who defend the rights of their class in a spirit which is not always marked with the reasoning and reasonable spirit.

Thirdly, the Church should be sympathetic with labor. This principle is also in accordance with the tradition of the Church. The founder of Christianity was a carpenter. His mother before His birth sang a song, the magnificat, which the Church still uses in its liturgical services, which speaks with considerable sympathy of the poor and of them of low degree, and rather disparagingly of the rich and the mighty. While He had friends among the rich and powerful and declared that Zacchaeus the publican could be saved although he had only given away one-half of his property, yet his ministry was marked by peculiar favor to the propertyless classes. The Church in its earliest years made so strong an appeal to the less fortunate that it has been described as a proletarian movement. Only in modern times, as a matter of fact, has it ceased to have a thoroughly democratic following.

The Church should doubtless be equally friendly to all classes. But the fact that it is so largely composed of the prosperous, and that labor is so largely alienated from all organized religion, lays upon it the particular obligation not to fail in its friendly attitude toward them that are without.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christian chivalry would seem to demand that it err, if it is to err at all, on the side of friendliness to labor and its claims.

Fourth, the Church should not be afraid of social change. It cannot afford to identify itself with any social order. Its function is not to preserve the *status quo* but to work for a new order, for what the Anglican Bishops assembled at Lambeth have called "a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life." Jesus Christ set his religion over against the claims of the world. The history of the Church has on the whole been the history of an institution independent of political and social change and superior to it.

The Church was born in Jerusalem, a city which within a generation fell in ruins. It had hardly established itself in the Roman empire when that empire was dissolved by the inroads of the northern barbarians. In the new kingdoms it made terms with feudalism, but feudalism at the end of the Middle Ages became extinct. When each of these systems passed away, the Jewish state, the Roman empire, the feudal system, it seemed to many who witnessed their passing to be the end of the world. But it was only a change to a new social order under which the Church was still able to work effectively in securing the triumph of its principles.

The fact, then, that labor is making new demands, and that if these demands if met may require fundamental social changes, should not prejudice its case with any true lover of the Church. Change in itself is from the Christian point of view neither good nor bad. Religion has a place both for change and for stability. The conservative and the radical both have their function in society and in religious circles. The duty of the Church is to work for what is good both in the present social order and in any other social order which the future may have in store.

Finally, the Church's attitude toward labor must be charged with the religious impulse. To the Christian be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liever his religion supplies the light to enable him to see life sanely and as it really is, it enables him to follow the dictates of reason, it gives him strength to bear burdens and to make sacrifices. It should perform a similar function for society. It should enable labor to purify its aims and to work for them with unflagging zeal. It should lift the mind of the employer into the realm of ideal ends where such petty considerations as his own personal comfort and his property rights will shrivel to their true proportions and where he can see things and men in the light of eternal truth.

Never at any time has the world needed the aid of the good which religion supplies, as in this weary, suffering, and uncertain age. The Church if it have a genuine and vital religion will engender in the men of our generation a hopeful and helpful attitude toward all social problems, including the problem of labor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EMPEROR OF AFRICA

The Psychology of Garveyism

By WILLIAM PICKENS

A WELL-KNOWN American negro writer deals with the picturesque rise and dramatic fall of Marcus Garvey, the Jamaican negro who took Harlem by storm with his plans for a Pan African Kingdom-Republic where negroes of every hue should gather together under the auspices of a black God and black angels. The real menace of Garveyism he also makes clear.

ON June 18th, 1923, Marcus Garvey, "Provisional President of Africa," after five weeks of serious trial interspersed with little comedies, was found guilty by a federal court in New York City of using the mails to defraud investors in the "Black Star Line" of dilapidated and mythical ships. This man Garvey was a fast worker: when he arrived from Jamaica just six years ago his friends in New York had to supply him with clothes and food, but when Judge Mack pronounced sentence against him he was paying one hundred and fifty dollars a month for a New York apartment furnished in the bizarre south-sea fashion, was drawing ten thousand dollars a year as "President General of the Universal Negro Improvement Association," an additional eleven thousand dollars as "Provisional President of Africa," and boasted a longer string of magniloquent titles than the King of England.

When Marcus Garvey was sentenced to the penitentiary, we wonder if the judge realized how many different personages were to be locked up in that one cell: "The Provisional President of Africa," "The President General of the Universal Negro Improvement Association," "The President of the Black Star Line" of ships, "The Commander in Chief of the African Legion," head of the "Distinguished Service Order of Ethiopia," "The President of the Negro Factories Corporation" and of the "African Communities League," the head of the "Booker Washington University," and the managing editor of "The Negro World" (a weekly), "The Black Man" (a monthly of odd months), and "The Negro Times" (an occasional "daily").

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a brief six years he had not only made a place, and perhaps laid away a fortune, for himself, but he had also wasted at the very lowest figure one million dollars for Negro washerwomen and workingmen. When the business of his "Black Star Line," for example, wound up, it owed about three-quarters of a million and had on hand just thirty-one dollars and seventy-five cents!

He probably received, managed, and disbursed, or rather disposed of, a greater variety of unaccounted-for "funds" than any other man of his decade. At frequent intervals "The Negro World" announced the opening of some new "fund" drive, without accounting adequately for the closing of the preceding one. There were "The African Redemption Fund," but Africa is still unredeemed; "The Liberian Loan Fund," and Liberia is still in need of the loan; the perennial "Convention Fund"; funds for factories, stores, and laundries, all of brief duration; "Black Star" funds; "Marcus Garvey Defense" funds, whenever somebody sued him for back salary or other debts; "Negro World" funds, daily paper funds, monthly magazine funds; funds to send emissaries to Liberia, who were allowed to become stranded there, to be a burden on Liberian charity, and to get back however they could; funds for "delegates to the League of Nations," to sit in the galleries and look on, when possible; and each time he married a new wife, his devoted people were inspired to raise an "appreciation" fund which however did not keep him from raiding the "Black Star" funds to the tune of nine hundred dollars for one of his honeymoons to Canada. He claimed Napoleon Bonaparte as his "ideal hero," and he even had his Josephine.

He is himself a Jamaican Negro and his organization began among West Indians in Harlem. Among his American Negro followers the "dues-paying" portion are below the average of intelligence for blacks of the continent, while most of the intelligent United States Negroes who joined the movement were in it for the sake of salaries, titles, and honors.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the western hemisphere Negroes may be divided into three divisions, according to their relationships to the whites among whom they live: the Latin-American group, where amalgamation is the rule; the British-American group, where subjection with benevolent paternalism is customary; and United States Negroes, where constitutional equality with "racial integrity," supported by varying degrees of segregation, is at present essayed. These differences account for the differing attitudes of these respective groups toward world problems and such schemes as Garvey's Black Republic of Africa.

A comparison of British-American Negroes with those of the United States shows that the phenomena of Garveyism are rather British. British West Indian Negroes are free from spectacular horrors, such as lynchings and mob massacres, yet a settled and fixed policy of caste makes their future outlook more hopeless than that of the Negroes in the Southern United States. The United States Negro, on the other hand, is constitutionally a part of the general citizenship, and although sentiment, maladministration, and unconstitutional procedure may deprive him temporarily of the full exercise of his rights, the *basis* of his claim is broader and better.

The Negro of the States is physically a part of his nation, while the West Indian Negro is a colonial, separated by an ocean from the power which rules over him. And like British colonials of many races he has an idea, tinged with hope, that some time he may become entirely independent. The West Indian blacks whom Garvey found in New York were therefore the first to be moved by the idea of entire racial separateness, even to the absurd extent of having a continent assigned to a color,—a condition which commercial interdependence and scientific intercommunication make impossible.

There are other differences in these group complexes that help to explain Garveyism: the American Negro is used to the theory, and more or less to the actuality, of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democracy and equality. If American Negroes had planned the "Republic of Africa," we should have heard nothing of "Knights and Ladies of Ethiopia," "Knights Commander of the Nile," and "Dukes of Uganda." Those are reactions of the British substratum. When Garvey was traveling through the States, advertising "Black Star" stock and "Back to Africa" schemes, he required the men and women of his retinue to address him as "Your Highness," and what was the amused astonishment of a colored American housewife in Ohio, who had rented rooms to Garvey and his followers, when one of Garvey's female attendants descended the stairway and announced: "His Highness would like ham and eggs, or pork chops and gravy, for his supper."

Other British earmarks can be seen in Garvey's "court receptions" and ceremonies, and in the self-awarded title, "Provisional President of Africa," following the example of De Valera, another British subject, who called himself "Provisional President of Ireland." And as soon as the President of Africa was ordered to jail he threatened the United States with a "hunger strike,"—which his healthy appetite has so far successfully opposed.

Another insular complex led Garvey astray when he appealed to the color-prejudice of "black" colored Americans. Being a black man himself, Garvey tried to draw the black Negroes of America away from those of lighter skin. But the color line of the whites against the whole Negro group in this country gives that many-colored group a consciousness of common interests. The British in the islands have three castes: white, colored, and black (or dark brown),—because that makes the matter easier for the whites. A united colored group in the West Indies would be an overwhelming majority, while in the States all the colored blood of every shade and degree added together constitutes only a one-tenth minority.

The American white, therefore, did not feel it necessary to make the triple distinction. Individual Negroes may have color sentiment, like any other "taste," and it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a vanishing tradition in a few localities where it originated in the pre-Civil War status of free mulattoes, as in Charleston, S. C., and New Orleans, La. But the color question has never made a group division of the colored people of the United States. With the consciousness of a black West Indian, Garvey had a chip on his shoulder for the lighter skins of the continent, and even after he was put in jail, he voiced the opinion that the whites and light skins were his worst enemies, although these colors had not been distinguished in the trial against him, and in spite of a fact which he knew well: that the four men who during the previous twelve months had done most to expose his frauds and destroy his influence in America, were dark Negroes of the average American type, one of them very dark, none of them a mulatto, and all of them Southern in origin: Chandler Owen and A. P. Randolph, editors, Robert W. Bagnall, and the present writer, citizens of Harlem.

He seemed not to realize that he would have to rule over every race and color under the sun, if he was to be Emperor of Africa,—from yellow Hottentots in the south to white Frenchmen and brunette Spaniards in the north; from the western Liberians, descended from American Negroes to the eastern Abyssinians, claiming descent from ancient Jews; stalwart Zulus and pigmy Bushmen; black Bantus, brown Moors, copper Egyptians; white South Africans, white settlers everywhere, and even Asiatics on the south and east. Nor did he realize how varied his subjects would be in national traditions; he ignored all problems of religious conflict, such as the inroads of Mohammedanism in unexpected corners of Africa; he was not aware that the Liberians are as different from the people of Abyssinia, as Mexicans are different from Russians; that there is no more in common between South Africa and North Africa than between Texas and Turkey. He did not know that the worst enemy a foreign usurper would find in Africa would be the Africans themselves. He had not a grammar grade understanding of Africa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His government was to be a cross between an empire and a republic; it was to have "dukes" and he was to be the "president." The democratic end of the hybrid may have been the contribution of his salaried American Negroes, and may be due to the "psychology of opposition," which the oppressed exhibit. If England, for example, had been Catholic, south Ireland might have been devotedly Protestant; if George the Third had been president of a republic, George Washington might have been made king. And inasmuch as man makes God in man's own image, he was to have a new religion with a black God and black angels. In short, wherever he had seen a white face and straight hair in his past experience, he would place a black face and kinky hair in his future empire.

We will not be so hard upon the British as to charge also to their training or example the colossal conceit of Marcus Garvey. His megalomania and love of exaggeration are individual freaks, rather than either national or racial traits. During the period of his empire building, perhaps to boost the imaginary grandeur of his sway, he always spoke of "the 400,000,000 Negroes of the world," when there are only about 150,000,000. Two years ago he claimed to have four million members; to-day he claims six million; while most analyses of his other figures and data indicate that he has never had more than twenty or thirty thousand dues-paying members. He loudly announced that his 1922 convention would have "one hundred and fifty thousand delegates," but when his convention had been in session for a month, the most hotly contested issues, like those for offices and salaries, registered a vote of less than two hundred yeas and nays.

Yet his naive-minded followers accept the myth of "the greatest Negro organization in the world," and look forward confidently to an early conquest of Africa against all the powers of Europe. Indeed Garvey announced, amid thunderous applause, at the opening of his 1922 convention: "If England wants peace, if France wants peace, if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Italy wants peace, I advise them to pack up bag and baggage and get out of Africa!" And to substantiate the threat he marched through the streets of Harlem with an "army" assembled from "all over the world" and numbering less than six thousand men, women, little children, "Black Cross Nurses," local sympathizers, and unorganized camp followers. The "President" headed the procession, uniformed and plumed like a German field marshal, and pursued by various kinds of nobles in bright-colored robes and tassels.

Garvey understands mass psychology, with perhaps little formal knowledge of the subject, and the post-war spirit of the world was his ally, as exemplified in "Zionism," the Irish struggle, "self-determination" of peoples, and the great Negro migrations from South to North in this country. Some of these migrants had greatly improved their condition by one move, and, as simple minds run, a longer and more daring move, to Africa or somewhere, would make their happiness complete. He declared for a "Black House" in Washington, to match the White House. He organized a ten million dollar ship corporation, without any money, and called it the "Black Star Line," to match the "White Star Line."

Each year he held a thirty-one days' convention to dispose of the affairs of the non-existent state of Africa. Before the opening of each big meeting in "Liberty Hall" on West 138th Street, he marched up and down the aisles and finally to the platform, surrounded by a bodyguard and followed by a chorus, carrying the red, black, and green tricolor of the African Republic and singing: "God bless our President!" Garvey made these people at least *feel* important. There were the "Black Cross Nurses," for the most part uneducated working women who did not know the first principles of first aid, and there were the soldiers, with uniforms and arms, feeling as heroic tramping through the aisles of "Liberty Hall" as if treading the highways of an empire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The human mind may dwell so long on an illusion that it will conceive that illusion as a reality. From the Tombs Prison in New York, Garvey proclaims to his subjects that he is "the victim of an international frame-up." He compares himself with O'Connell, MacSwiney, Gandhi, and Jesus. He regarded the judge and the United States district attorney as international and interracial tools. Petulant and suspicious, he dismissed his attorney and took charge of his own case, greatly delaying the progress of the court by his ignorance of the law, and creating a sort of "comedy of errors" by presenting the attorney Marcus Garvey, for the defendant Marcus Garvey, examining the witness Marcus Garvey. In summing up his case to the jury he talked for three hours, in true "Liberty Hall" propaganda style, expecting to overcome the evidence by the sheer multitudinousness and vehemency of his words. If sincere, he did not realize that he was *not* being tried for being the "President of Africa," for attempting to build a ship line, for rating himself as the only saviour of "the 400,000,000 Negroes of the world," nor for meeting the arrogant claim of Caucasian superiority with the equally absurd claim of black superiority,—but that he was being tried for the ordinary private crime of using the United States mail to defraud investors in a mythical ship. For stealing from his own subjects and supporters he was condemned on *their* testimony.

Some of his followers, believing that he was being persecuted for his doctrines, intimidated witnesses, wrote threats to the prosecutor and the court, and when on the last day he was being led away to prison, some of these dropped to their knees on the crowded pavement and asked God to intervene, informing Him that Garvey was being punished for the same reason that Jesus was crucified, ignoring the fact that the Man of Nazareth was never connected with financial fraud and debacle.

Intelligent American Negroes had only laughed at Garveyism, but became almost solid against him when in 1922

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he launched the African Republic into the treaty-making business by apparently concluding the first pact with the Ku Klux Klan,—the Klan getting all the advantage in the diplomatic exchanges. When the invisible "government of Africa" came to an understanding with the "invisible empire of America," naturally the terms of agreement had to be a secret, but they are easily inferred from Garvey's voluminous speeches immediately following his visit to Atlanta, where he had conferred with the "Imperial Wizard." The Ku Klux Klan were to be given America, so far as Garvey was concerned, and in return for his preaching that "this is a white man's country" he and his followers were to be allowed to take Africa,—so far as the "Imperial Wizard" was concerned.

Then it was that the greater number of intelligent American Negroes decided that Garveyism had passed from the stage of amusing parade into a phase of actual menace to interracial tranquility. Nobody had ever feared that he would lead all Negroes back to Africa,—England and France would see to that,—nor that he could lead as many as one out of every ten thousand American Negroes anywhere. But there was the real danger of robbing the ignorant blacks of the South, thus rousing interracial suspicion and antagonism. It was decided that "Garvey must go!" And the four colored Americans whom we have named, issued a circular bearing that title and arranged a series of meetings to expose Garveyism in Harlem. Some of his uniformed legionaries and fanatics came to break up the meeting with knives and clubs. Police protection was secured and the exposé went on, every meeting drawing a bigger and bigger crowd of determined colored Americans, and the menace and folly of the "back to Africa" program was made plainer than it had ever before been made.

And there is a moral to the tale: it must be considered that Garveyism could never happen simply because there was a Marcus Garvey. There was an opportunity for him and a response to him. This opportunity consists in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general repression of the Negro and Negroid peoples of parts of North America and parts of Africa. Like all humans the Negro is striving for self-expression and self-realization. And if these normal instincts are abnormally repressed, it will make him a prey to sharks and a menace to society. The very nature of this "black world" organization attracted into it sharks who would rend it to pieces, but the instinct for self-realization will still persist and must be invited and guided into useful channels or it will break out again in some new direction of waste and folly.

Life must somehow be made more normal for the colored minorities who live among white populations or who are in the power of governments dominated by whites. Movements for the advancement of the interests of such colored people must involve the co-operation of white and black. A movement of White against Black, like the Klan, or a movement of Black in contradistinction to White, like Garveyism, must do more harm than good.

Human science and intercommunication have made it improbable that the earth will ever again be divided geographically among monochromatic populations. The idea that one race should be set, geographically or otherwise, over against another is a reversion in civilization. Twelve million colored people of the United States can only consider plans for progress *in America,* but no fantastic schemes for egress from America. Any movement pivoted on any outside world is doomed to failure among this people.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PASTIME

By Amy Lowell

"Whose pretty pawn is this,
And what shall be done to redeem it?"
Children's Game.

I am immoderately fond of this place.
My thoughts run under it like the roots of trees and grasses,
They spread above it like fluttering, inconsequential leaves.
Spring comes to me with the blossoming of the snowdrop
under the arbor-vitae.
So all Springs come, and ever must do.
Spring ripens with the crocus cups on the South lawn,
Blue and white crocuses, remains of an ancient garden,
By the side of an ancient house—
So they told me, so I believed.
That shadowy structure holds a distant charm,
I see its walls printed upon the air, in certain moods,
And build it back into solidity with awed enjoyment.
But that is fairy-tale or history,
And I am more concerned with recollection.

How perpetually the seasons mark themselves!
Tulips for April,
Peonies for May.
The pillar-rose has not lacked its robin's-nest since I remember,
Nor the pink horse-chestnut its mob of honey-bees;
The boom of them is essence of sleep and flowers,
Of Summer sleep and poetry mixed together.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet there are differences even in the repeated lilt of time.
I seem to think the humming-birds are fewer,
And I have not seen a luna-moth for years.
Now, suddenly, here is a grosbeak
Perched in the double-cherry near the door.
He suggests that I look him over,
His striped black and white,
His rose-red triangle of waistcoat.
He is clearly on view for commendation,
Displaying himself as though I were his wife or his tailor
Observing to pronounce a verdict.
I had contemplated second childhood,
But scarcely believed it imminent,
And here I am plunged in it.
A rose-breasted grosbeak indeed,
And the last I saw was in that long, first childhood.
Senility may have its compensations,
I shall hunt up my old butterfly net
And prowl about to-night seeking luna-moths.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENCY IN 1924?

(8) Republican—Frank O. Lowden

By CHARLES WILLIS THOMPSON

WILL the ex-Governor of Illinois consent to become a Republican candidate, with President Harding still in the field? Lowden's dramatic renunciation of the candidacy in 1916 *would seem to indicate that he is reluctant to enter the lists as the President's rival.*

THE unmistakable if unostentatious revival of the 1916 Lowden boom would almost lead the searchers of the skies to believe that the Republicans expect the Democrats to nominate Governor Smith, so close is the analogy between the former Governor of Illinois and the present Governor of New York. Lowden swung a vigorous flail and inaugurated in Illinois reforms which Smith has championed,—and to some extent brought about,—in New York. He was a little sharper, a little more pungent, and he would undoubtedly, if it came down to cases, take a different position on the question of liquor for public consumption, for you don't get far in the Middle West if you say anything about the Volstead law or any state enforcement law infringing the Constitutional rights of the citizen.

Then, too, Lowden is the business men's candidate. It was in that capacity he was touted in 1916. The Senate leaders were eager to try such an experiment. In times past various candidates had traveled under the banner of business, but they were all lawyers and politicians at heart, supported by business men who could find no candidate more adapted to their purpose. Lowden was a man who could show business men how to do business, and had done it. It is true he held a lawyer's diploma, but as Dean Swift remarked, being born in a stable doesn't make a man an ass. Woodrow Wilson has a lawyer's diploma, but he is essentially and by nature a teacher, as Roosevelt acutely saw and sarcastically remarked.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although Lowden is essentially and by nature a business man, there are other fields in which he is more than an amateur. For instance, he savagely resents the suggestion that he is a parlor farmer, and holds that he is a dirt farmer to the last callus. Call Lowden an agriculturist and you will get his blood, or he yours. He has the biggest farm in Illinois and operates it himself. But he thinks, likes, hates, works, idles, like a business man, only more thoroughly than any of the rest. Not in the manner of a millionaire or a plunger, be it observed; simply in the manner of a business man. If he became President he would be the first business man we have ever had in the White House.

He would not be a candidate unless Harding were out of it, but the searchers of the skies, especially those astronomers who use the telescope in conjunction with a sandbag, are daily growing more convinced that they can get Harding out. At the moment it is difficult to see how they can do it, for though Harding might have entertained such an idea a month ago, he is now making speeches to cheering crowds,—for all the world like a confident candidate. But he will come back to the glacial banks of the Potomac long before the Convention, and it will be remembered that the gray wolves of the Senate once persuaded Hayes, who made an excellent record, that there was no reason why he should run on it and be defeated.

The politicians, who are not necessarily crooks, but men even as you and I, were honestly looking for a business man on the shores of Lake Michigan three years ago, and they found him in Lowden. There is not the shadow of a doubt that Lowden and not Harding would be President today had it not been for the dirty work of one of Lowden's lieutenants in a State that doesn't touch the Great Lakes.

This dirty work consisted in handing money to two local bosses, to win their support. The money was given to them not as delegates but as minor bosses. Lowden knew nothing of the performance. It happened, however, just as a Congressional committee was investigating the Presidential ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penses of candidates with a view to killing off Wood, whose backers had expended the most, though in legitimate ways. The investigation was steered carefully away from Johnson, whom the Senators were rather inclined to favor as second choice if this scandal should kill Lowden, as it did.

Johnson, however, ruined his prospects by refusing to give any hint of his intentions toward the organization in the Senate,—a comparatively small matter in the eyes of the public, but infinitely important to the twelve or fifteen men, headed by Penrose, who were running it. For the same reason they were opposed to Wood; nobody could tell what he would do, but it was certain that he would decline to run with any machine on earth.

Even then they were inclined to run Lowden, but at a famous conference in George Harvey's rooms at the Blackstone Hotel, it was demonstrated to be an unwise move, and Harding was informally nominated then and there,—formally the next day. It was agreed that Lowden, to whom the nomination had been virtually promised, should have "a run for his money" for a few ballots. Lowden heard about it in the morning, dashed down to the Convention Hall, and taking a position on the steps of the building, refused to take the "run for his money" or to participate in any details, released his followers from their support of him, and told them to vote for any one they chose. Even then, such is the devotion of men to Frank Lowden, most of his men refused to be released, and doggedly stuck to this candidate, no longer a candidate, for ten solid ballots.

For Lowden is a lovable man. He has warm-hearted ways, though they do not seem to attract attention in the newspapers. Probably no stranger ever shook hands with Lowden without saying mentally, "I'd like to vote for that man." He was always his own best campaigner, though that is not saying much, to judge by those who got him into that mess in Missouri in 1920.

Now, with all this you would expect the air to be thick with anecdotes about him, human interest stories as vivid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the account of how the late Mayor Gaynor rambled down to the Battery disseminating peanuts among the offspring of the proletariat; or witty comebacks in the style of the late Champ Clark, who, hearing some party opponent demolish him orally and announce himself as the lineal descendant of a tenderfoot who had come into the Ozarks looking for a grizzly, completed the anecdote by telling how the relief expedition buried the body with the brief inscription: "He whistled for the grizzly, and the grizzly came."

But no one who goes on the trail of Lowden seeking game will come back empty-handed. As Champ Clark's boomers remarked of him in the "literature" put forth about him in 1920, "Doesn't he look like a President?" If looking were all, poor Champ certainly qualified; and so does Lowden, when you meet him, with those brilliant eyes, that searching glance, that high head with its crown of noble white. The trouble is that, strong as this impression is when you meet him, it does not carry over into his lithographs. In the campaign pictures he looks foxy rather than lion-like, and whatever may be said of photographs, it certainly cannot be said of campaign pictures that they do not lie. Usually, however, they lie to the advantage of the candidate. In fact, I remember no case save Lowden's where they have ever lied to the candidate's disadvantage.

Queerly enough, too, this is not due to any lack of humanness or any shrinking from the spectacular on Lowden's part. The man who smashed up Mayor Thompson's pro-German mass meeting at a time when almost all other Mayors and Governors in the Middle West were marathoning for the top fence rail did not lack intellectual brawn. The "bouncing" of those Missourians was dramatic; nor was the dramatic touch lacking in Lowden's refusal of that civic crown which the bosses tendered to him in the midnight conference at the Blackstone, in the form of a "run for his money." For all that he has never appealed to the public imagination, although he has always remained popular.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Especially has he remained popular with the machine, and that means something, in spite of the popular mental picture of the machine as consisting of three or four politicians holding together in deadly fear of being discovered by the brawny and honest masses and beaten to death by them. The machine consists of the enrolled Republicans or Democrats of a State; and theoretically of the enrolled Socialists, too. Even with the Socialists, however, it would mean a good deal to say that a man had a "drag" with the machine, since the outer machine of all parties has at all times the power to pull down the inner machine, if one exists, and frequently exerts that power.

But Illinois has never been a one-boss State, as Pennsylvania can be said to have been when its Republicanism was ruled by Matthew Stanley Quay or Boies Penrose, and its Democratic policies by James M. Guffey. There have been two factions fighting for the control of Illinois Republicanism, up-State and down-State. That did not so often happen with the Democracy, however, for the Democrats, as in New York, were chiefly concentrated in a city which made it impossible for David B. Hill, on becoming boss of New York State, to take the city machine away from Richard Croker. There were, however, some Republicans in Chicago to reinforce the up-State faction. When the Republicans held the city, they became known as the "city crowd" as against "the Federal crowd." The latter was represented usually by the two United States Senators.

Hence Lowden made his debut as a candidate for the gubernatorial nomination as against Governor Yates and Charles S. Deneen, each seeking to establish a machine. That was a historic convention. They voted twenty-one days, and then nominated Deneen on the one hundred and twenty-fifth ballot. Subsequently Lowden ran again in a less sensational campaign and was nominated and elected.

He was a sort of Republican Al Smith; that is, his program was very similar to that of Governor Smith. As Smith has always had his Legislature against him and has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had partisan opposition, while Lowden has never had more then factional opposition, the Illinois man has been more successful than the New Yorker in achieving such reforms as the budget, the minimum wage, highway extension, and others on the program of both. Lowden's ideas have sometimes been grandiose; he was one of those who conceived the idea of linking the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico by highway, and turned the first bit of sod for it after getting it authorized.

He resembled Smith, too, in the sharp, prompt, quick way with which he met situations, and in being utterly unafraid; though he was, being a Republican, far more conservative than Smith, and would not have pardoned imprisoned Socialists nor put as many social reform planks in his program as did Smith. He did what he could to forward agricultural legislation and always took a keen interest in protecting the farmers' interests, and this was unaffected, for Lowden is proud to call himself a farmer.

Up to the time the United States entered the war Lowden was a neutral, though he never, like most neutrals, laid himself open to the suspicion of taking the German side. But from the moment it began to appear that the United States was likely to be drawn into the collision the Governor began to prepare the State, so that when the declaration came, Illinois was more nearly ready than any other State in the Union and had three regiments to turn over to the Federal Government, besides having all the other necessary preparations in good shape. In one of these regiments Lowden had risen to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, so that he is frequently addressed as "Colonel," though he does not like it. His son served in this regiment overseas.

The pro-Germans organized a monster meeting in Chicago, and Lowden called on Mayor Thompson to stop it. The Mayor replied that he had no authority to stop it and that the meeting would go on. Lowden promptly surrounded the building with troops and the meeting did not go on. Throughout the war Illinois made a magnificent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

record, though it had been reckoned as one of the danger spots because of the spread of pro-Germanism and because of Mayor Thompson's use of the authority of the City of Chicago.

Thompson built up what was called the Thompson machine, and with it he fought Governor Lowden at every convention and other gathering of Republicans. It was a drawn game until after Lowden's retirement from office, when Thompson was at last overthrown at the polls by the Democrats under their new boss, George E. Brennan. It was really Fred Lundin's machine, for Thompson was only the figurehead, as Murphy is in New York.

Lowden, while known only as a dashing and brilliant lawyer, but not a politician, married one of the daughters of George M. Pullman. He himself was the son of a blacksmith, although once when he was running for office his opponent, also the son of a blacksmith, charged that Lowden's father was only a blacksmith on the side and that his main business was that of a farmer. Whenever he ran for Congress it was charged that "the Pullman millions" were trying to capture a Congress district. By the time he began running for Governor, however, this sort of attack had pretty well worn itself out and is not so much heard of now, although it occasionally pops up. The fact is that Lowden has made a great deal of money for himself.

His interests lie chiefly in the direction of business, which does not mean capital as against labor. The labor people were generally well enough satisfied with him. The word "business" should be interpreted to mean that Lowden is fascinated with bringing trade out of chaos and reorganizing it to the advantage of all classes.

But Lowden will not run against Harding unless the Convention is thrown open. That is not likely to be the case unless the President withdraws, but it is possible that other events may change the situation between now and next June, and his friends are preparing to plunge the ex-Governor into the scramble if any such contingency arises.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENCY IN 1924?

(8) Democratic—William Jennings Bryan

By LOUIS MARTIN SEARS

THAT Mr. Bryan should be regarded as a ripe case for the psycho-analyst rather than an inspired leader in the field of politics and religion is the thesis of Mr. Sears, who maintains that the whole career of the Great Commoner furnishes evidence that he is obsessed with a mental "complex."

A WHOLESOME development in the recent interpretation of social phenomena has been the shift from the economic and the geographic to the psychological. The substitution of case studies for *à priori* generalizations is a step in the direction of a proper humility and the creation of a body of data from which in the remote future a sounder synthesis may evolve. Whether it be an appreciation of the reign of Louis XI in terms of the recently demonstrated epilepsy of the monarch or a case study of some obscure delinquent, emphasis is now placed upon the individual as an isolated phenomenon, a world in himself of whom never enough can be known. In a sense, the recovered appreciation of the individual is a recognition of the truth of Carlyle's formulary that history is the product of the hero, far more completely than is the hero the reflex of his own times.

To one who even partially accepts this neo-Carlylian interpretation of history, the career of William Jennings Bryan offers a most interesting field for speculation. For in Bryan certain eternal forces have found a champion, whose individual mental processes conform to rather definitely ascertained principles. As such, Bryan is a product of our environment. But in his dynamic leadership, he modifies his environment and becomes a personal force to be reckoned with in whatever field he exerts himself. In contemplating Bryan as a possible candidate again for the prize for which he has so often competed, one thinks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of him not as a politician, but as a human dynamo driven by two or three powerful and picturesque delusions. He comes periodically before the public, not with a statesmanlike platform to submit, but with a mental complex to unburden.

The paradox of Bryan's career is, of course, his reversion from an apparent if somewhat unreal liberalism in politics to a reactionary obstructionism in theology which grieves and amazes the more thoughtful of his original followers. However, it is possible to argue that the paradox itself is more apparent than real. For Bryan, who in a certain sense as the protégé of Lyman Trumbull was the official heir of Lincoln, was by nature debarred from the moral heirship to the great liberal, whose clarity and balance were the fruit of a careful avoidance of extremes, whereas extremes are the spice of existence for Mr. Bryan.

Again, the identification of Mr. Bryan with the Free Silver Movement, which is undoubtedly his most popular claim to liberalism, was rather an impulse than an idea, and for being truly liberal lacked the prime essential of fairness. For a gigantic scheme of defrauding creditors and enriching silver miners, even though it might make a specious appeal to millions of his less prosperous fellow citizens, fell considerably short of the justice and moderation which are the boast of a humane liberalism.

Similarly the obscurantism which impels Mr. Bryan to devote his declining years to purging the Presbyterian Church of its progressive leadership must in all charity be recognized as a stupid failure to apprehend the identity of liberalism as one spirit, whether political, social, economic, or religious, moving yesterday, today, and forever for the illuminating of dark places and the guiding of mankind into a better way. So interpreted, Mr. Bryan is less a liberal and less a reactionary than he has been variously estimated. His shallowness of intellect has debarred him from any real appreciation of the movements with which he has aligned himself. The vast influence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he has exerted must be explained solely from the emotional fervor with which he has thrown himself into the fray.

It is self-evident that nothing short of supreme egotism would encourage a man to speak as Sir Oracle on matters so diverse as the platform of the Democratic Party and the program of the Presbyterian Church. But there has been little in Mr. Bryan's career, notwithstanding his failure to win the great prize, to foster any spirit of humility. As a student in a small inland college at Jacksonville, Illinois, more than a generation ago, he came into mental contact with the classics and an inherited traditionary scholarship in which the humility of the experimental scientist picking up a pebble or so on the shore of an unknown sea was conspicuous for its absence.

Proficiency in classic and traditionary studies promotes not humbleness of mind but rather pride of opinion, and is in full harmony with the elderly Bryan's refusal to open his mind to the products of research whether in science or in religion. Openness of mind is in fact so foreign to Mr. Bryan that he would scarcely be the man he is were he ever troubled by any doubts of his own inspiration and that of the authorities which he chooses to accept.

The insularity inherent in the temperament and training of Mr. Bryan lost nothing through the development of his gift of oratory. It is unusual for oratory and true scholarly instinct to possess the same body. The orator sways the minds of his hearers through the magic of words rather than through the judgment of the intellect. And to the extent that the orator's success is independent of sound thinking on his own part, or indeed, of almost any thinking at all, so the reaction of this success upon his own mind is to cheapen the labored and unspectacular triumphs of pure reason and to glorify the often tawdry vanities of popular acclaim.

But Mr. Bryan's self-confidence need not be imputed solely to the vanity inherent in oratory. As a politician he has gone far, and his influence in the councils of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party is beyond dispute. At times it has been exerted even wisely, though one is inclined to question whether this was not by accident. The combination at all events of an amazing power of speech together with the political eminence procured thereby has created in Mr. Bryan a complex which has been noted among various Americans of distinction,—a complex which for lack of a better description might be termed a delusion of omniscience. Andrew Carnegie suffered from it.

A colossal success as an iron-monger, he, like, Bryan, became convinced of his authority in matters religious. Unlike Bryan, he took a negative stand, and frequently shocked the sensibilities of good men, as, for example, when at his installation as Lord Rector at the University of St. Andrews, he seized the occasion with the utmost maladroitness to proclaim his disbelief in immortality. To choose an illustration from another field, Thomas Edison will point a moral.

More than any other man in our time, Mr. Edison has attained to pre-eminence in the field of applied science. But his pretentions to authority in the field of education would be pathetic were they not ridiculous. He is equally absurd whether in defining a set of questions wherewith to stump collegians or in asserting that the "movies" can supersede drill and sound in the training of children. In the same category belongs Henry Ford. No one has ever equalled Mr. Ford in the quantity production of an inexpensive commodity. And he ranks as America's supreme example of business achievement. Men rightly smile, however, at his tilts with windmills, and few in their senses would care to place him in the White House.

Carnegie, Edison, and Ford are highly specialized examples of a rather widespread tendency among Americans who have succeeded in terms of the dollar, to set up as authorities on all matters whatsoever. But Mr. Bryan does not need these highly differentiated illustrations as warrant for his own practice. The phenomenon described is almost universal among politicians. The successful politi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cian is *ipso facto* an expert, but expert only at the winning of votes. A man may charm votes, charm he never so wisely, and yet be innocent of ideas as well as ideals, and far from qualified to discourse wisdom with respect to tariffs and world courts, Ku Klux Klans, Leagues of Nations, prohibition, and immigration. Yet the politician must needs have a smattering on all these points plus the ability to pose as an expert. All which lends zest to the great American game of bluff, in which the artists become so adept as to deceive themselves, Mr. Bryan not least among them.

To the orator spell-binding with generalities that glitter, and to the politician framing panaceas for the country's ills, attention to details is a nuisance. Thus Mr. Bryan, called to the serious business of administering the State Department in a critical time, was at his best when signing treaties of arbitration with neighboring lands, and at his worst when refusing to bother with replies to the exigent inquiries of our ambassador at the Court of St. James. So gross was his negligence in this important matter that Mr. Walter Hines Page felt almost like a diver whose communication has been cut. As a result, the ambassador developed an animosity toward and contempt for his chief which was almost hysterical.

Mr. Bryan's amiable futility as Secretary of State is a most significant chapter in his biography. But for the present interpretation it is of interest chiefly from its revelations of the subject's utter inability and refusal to grapple with a concrete problem and reach a clear-cut solution. The State Department called for intellect. Emotion was no substitute, but it was all that Mr. Bryan possessed. He occupied his post too long for his own fame and for the country's good.

This constitutional inability "to think without confusion, clearly" is fundamentally responsible for Mr. Bryan's failure to carry with him the intelligentsia of the country. This very limitation has undoubtedly contributed to his perhaps unconscious contempt for intellectuals as well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as for intellect, and it is reasonable to ascribe to it some responsibility for an attitude of Mr. Bryan so strongly held as to amount to a mental complex.

One of the peculiarities of the inferiority complex is its outward manifestation of arrogance. It has been plausibly argued that Mr. William Randolph Hearst's excessive bluster and insatiable craving for the spotlight are at basis only a protective wall erected by the organism in order to combat the timidity of Mr. Hearst's real self, his inner nature, manifested in his youth under the form of a truly pitiful bashfulness. Similarly the arrogance which leads Mr. Bryan to transfer his political bossism to the field of religion where he hopes to root out the "heresies" of men better and wiser than himself, is only superficial.

Mr. Bryan, who has so long maintained a position of eminence in the country, has become without any conscious humility on his own part, a victim of the inferiority complex. Dimly, perhaps only subconsciously, he recognizes his limitations, and in order to reassure his egotism, he assumes a superiority to petty men who piece knowledge together bit by bit toward the erection of a system of science and religion altogether incomprehensible to the untutored mind. One may venture to believe that Jehovah to whom belong the cattle on a thousand hills, and whose footstool is the earth and all the fullness thereof, is less in need of Mr. Bryan as a champion than Mr. Bryan is in need of Jehovah in order to silence the doubts of his own omniscience and erect an altar for his self-respect far above the cavils of men who merely plod and think.

It may seem a trifle malicious to suggest that the same inferiority complex which is responsible for so presumptuous a mingling in the affairs of the Church is responsible for interest in the Church itself. But there is the familiar case of the woman disappointed of marriage who finds satisfaction for repressed energies and longings in extreme devotion to Mother Church. And Mr. Bryan, though a superficial success as a politician, owing to re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peated failure of the goal he set, is of necessity a disappointment to himself. Certainly his shift from party politics to the politics of religion is fully consistent with the inferiority complex, a sublimation of his former self, and a transfer of interest to a related but less congenial field. To fail here also spells genuine humiliation. It is not beyond belief that Mr. Bryan chafes at his failure to secure the Moderatorship of the Presbyterian Church more than he ever lamented his failure to gain the Presidency of the United States.

It is surely an irony that Bryan the Pacifist should oppose an evolutionary process wherein lies the best hope of peace. Man is doomed to be the slave of the tools he has created, and perhaps to perish at their hands, unless he can restore the superiority of mind over matter, of those larger aspects of mind which will render science the handmaid of progress rather than the instrument of death. Yet Mr. Bryan as the champion of revealed religion and verbal inspiration of the Bible deliberately closes the door to the largest fields wherein the mind and soul can range. And in his zeal against evolution so-called, he fights for an arrested development under which the race would be forever condemned to its present misery.

The effect of repression in this vital field of inquiry is familiar to anyone who has noted the hang-dog expression of persons who accept too seriously the teachings of "authority." Churches which magnify the power of authority produce the greater number of these dwarfed personalities, though fortunately their number is limited because few men even in the most priest-ridden churches are sufficiently plastic to receive the full injury. Yet Mr. Bryan, nominal exponent of Protestantism, adds to the inconsistencies of his pacifism, the irony of priestcraft.

It is all a part of Mr. Bryan's loose thinking, a constitutional incapacity to cope with fundamentals. The same vagueness which encouraged him in 1896 to heed the cry of the untutored to pay their debts in base coin and win

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an earthly competence at the expense of their creditors, now leads him to offer Heaven to men who passively accept the formulæ of revealed religion, and are too lazy or incompetent to wrest from Heaven itself fresh revelations with the aid of that key which Science has provided.

And so one returns to the starting-point. William Jennings Bryan as "fundamentalist" or as presidential aspirant, is a case study pure and simple. The present inquiry merely hints at certain outstanding features. Only a complete biography on a large scale, written with detachment, could do justice to so important a contributor to the variety and perplexity of our age.

But such a study, it seems evident to the present writer at any rate, must reckon with Bryan as a force in the emotional world only, scarcely at all in the intellectual, and must seek in the subconscious mind of the subject for a recognition of deficiencies which produce in his outward conduct the appearance rather of egotism and the superiority complex.

With it all must go the admission that Mr. Bryan as the very incarnation of moral force has long maintained a place in the affections of the very men who least subscribe to his ideas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FIFTEEN FINEST NOVELS

By WILLIAM LYON PHELPS

A NUMBER of great novels, familiar to all well-read people, are discussed by one of America's most popular professors of literature. His selection of the fifteen "best," however arbitrary it may be, is highly diverting.

THIS has been another year for the making of lists; we have been handed the ten books one would take to a desert island, the best ten books of the twentieth century, and a comparison of the books in English published from 1900 to 1923 with those that appeared in 1800 to 1823. I declined to enter the desert-island competition, for I do not see how anyone can decide what he will do until the emergency arrives, and this particular crisis seems as remote as the end of the world. However, if I should go to a desert island, the first volume I should take would be a blank book, in order to note new impressions.

One more list can do no harm. It may arouse some opposition; what is known in modern novels as a "cold fury." Nothing pleases me more than to bring readers and critics into a state of violent rage, and nothing is surer to attain that end than to publish a list of best books. The fact that the list-maker can never prove he is right and nobody can prove he is wrong, constitutes an irresistible temptation.

Whatever may be the relative value of the literary production of the early years of the nineteenth as compared with the twentieth century, there can hardly be much doubt that the golden age of the novel came in the thirty years or so that followed 1850. In that period flourished Turgenev, Tolstoi, Dostoevski, Dickens, Thackeray, George Eliot, Meredith, Thomas Hardy, Hawthorne, Mark

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Twain, Dumas, Flaubert, Victor Hugo, Björnson, and others who would seem big in other epochs.

In the list that follows, England scores six times, France four, Russia three, America two. Every reader will wish to make additions and subtractions, and it is vain for me to attempt to "explain" my list, which speaks for itself. But certain omissions are glaring. Germany, which leads and will probably forever lead the world in music, and has made magnificent contributions to poetry and drama, has almost no place in the history of the novel, so far as the production of masterpieces is concerned. Undoubtedly *Wilhelm Meister* has a wider influence than *The Scarlet Letter;* but in a discussion confined to novels, which is a strict art form, some attention must be paid to construction. Goethe, who had perhaps the most spacious mind since Aristotle, enriched the pages of *Wilhelm Meister* as he adorned every subject he touched except mathematics; but the book is a commentary on human nature rather than a novel. Still, I feel qualms in omitting it.

To leave out the name of Walter Scott is curious. If we could take the whole bulk of his work rather than one book, he would certainly be included among the fifteen novelists, and Swift would have to depart; but we are considering single works. Scott is like a mountain range rather than a peak. If I had included any of his books, it would be *The Bride of Lammermoor.* I hate to leave out one of my prime favorites,—Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice,* which to my notion is a flawless novel. But looking at the subject from a world standpoint, her masterpiece does not have the standing in foreign countries equal to that of any other book on my list. Perhaps it is too exclusively English. Thus no woman appears in my list.

I ought, of course, to add that my fifteen include only modern works, that is, books that can strictly be called novels, not considering works like Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* or Cervantes' *Don Quixote.* I present by list in chronological order.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) by DANIEL DEFOE.

This is the first English novel. It is curious that the novel in England began with a masterpiece, but such is the fact. Defoe was fifty-eight years old when he wrote his first story, and indeed most masterpieces of prose fiction have been written in years of maturity. Music and poetry come early; by the mysterious processes of genius, composers and poets are enabled to express in perfect form the profoundest truths of life at a time when they have had hardly any experience of it; but it is not so with the novelists. In the whole range of English fiction, Dickens is the only one who produced masterpieces before he was thirty. In *Robinson Crusoe,* Defoe added to the scant population of immortal personages by creating a character who is more real than fact, and who is known to men, women, and children throughout the world. The verisimilitude of his style is so perfect that the practical curiosity of children is abundantly satisfied.

Defoe's personality is as mysterious as Shakespeare's. Nobody knows what he really thought. No one can tell whether his elaborate moralizings were sincere, or whether he wrote them with his tongue in his cheek.

2. *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) by JONATHAN SWIFT.

Defoe was a germinal writer, and his "grave, imperturbable lying" was adopted by an even greater genius, Swift, whose prose style has never been excelled. Swift was also fifty-eight when he wrote this work, which exhibits the full maturity of his powers as yet untouched by decay. Although he intended it as a satire "on that animal called man," and so completely succeeded that it is probably the most terrible satire ever written, he brought to its composition such art, such imagination, such humor, that for two hundred years it has delighted the object of its scorn.

By a curious irony of fate, it has been a standard book for children. Could Swift, who wrote it with vitriolic passion, have imagined that for all time it would be the par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticular joy of boys and girls? Like *Robinson Crusoe,* it answers all their definite questions, for the drawings in the first two books are exactly according to scale. In the third book he made an amazing prophecy of the two satellites of Mars, which were not discovered till 1878.

3. *Clarissa* (1747-8) by SAMUEL RICHARDSON.

Alfred de Musset called this *le premier roman du monde.* Like the two preceding books, it was written when its author was fifty-eight, which seems to have been a lucky age for our first novelists. It is one of the longest of English works of fiction, filling eight volumes; but those who have the patience to read it, as I have, will find that it steadily grows in interest, and that its length is essential to its plan. When it was first published, readers were kept in suspense as to the outcome; the women read it sobbing, the men cursing, and all implored Richardson to spare the life of his heroine. He was deaf to their entreaties; heard only the voice of his artistic conscience. Today probably every one who reads it knows its tragic conclusion; that knowledge does not detract from its intensity. It rather adds to it, for we see the horrible fate approaching, as sure as it is slow. Barrett Wendell once told me that he endeavored to reread *Clarissa,* but could not, for he constantly burst out crying. No novel was ever written with more sincerity or more dignity, and anyone who doubts Richardson's genius has never read the book through. Its influence in foreign countries has been prodigious, and it practically loses nothing in tranlation.

4. *The History of Tom Jones* (1749) by HENRY FIELDING.

Many believe this to be the greatest of English novels; personally I prefer *David Copperfield.* Fielding is as modern in his temperament as if he were living today, and Tom Jones is the natural man of all time. Fielding's greatness was as immediately recognized as was that of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enemy, and indeed there is not a single man on our list who did not enjoy fame in his lifetime. It is an error to suppose that works of genius are not speedily recognized and appreciated. It is easy to slight contemporary criticism, and point out cases of overvaluation; but as a rule contemporary opinion rates works of genius at their full value, and for the same reasons that are clear to posterity.

Fielding, to whom Richardson's morality in *Pamela* was abhorrent, began to write a burlesque in *Joseph Andrews;* but the book got away from him and stands on its own merits. Still one ought to be additionally grateful to Richardson for stirring up such hostility, as he gave Fielding a good start. Although the supreme excellence of *Tom Jones* was immediately apparent, the true character of Fielding was not fully understood till the twentieth century, when his biography appeared, written by Wilbur Cross. This admirable work may be regarded as the final judgment on its hero.

5. *Eugénie Grandet* (1833) by HONORE DE BALZAC.

This is universally acknowledged to be one of the best by its author, and it is my favorite. I like it better than *Père Goriot,* which was written the year following, because it is free from the exaggeration which mars that powerful book. The absolute simplicity of the style, the smooth course of the narrative, the absence of author's interference, the noble objectivity of the thing, combine to give it that serenity which characterizes so many immortal works of art. The contrast between Eugénie and her father, together with the similarity, make a lasting impression. He is more terrible than an army with banners, more terrifying than the hobgoblins of romance, and as real as life. His dry expression, *"Nous verrons cela,"* is like a death sentence from the bench. Balzac, unlike most English novelists, stands completely outside the circle of his story, and simply reports what happens.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6. *Les Trois Mousquetaires* (1844), and its sequels: *Vingt Ans Après* (1845), *Le Vicomte de Bragelonne* (1848-1850) by ALEXANDRE DUMAS.

I never enjoyed any novel more than this. D'Artagnan and the three musketeers ought to be among the intimate friends of every man, woman, and child in the world who knows how to read. This is the ideal romance, where something happens on every page, where the personages abound in vitality, where the conversations sparkle with vivacity and wit. It is for the latter reason that every one who can should read these volumes in the original. Like everybody else, I read them first in my native tongue, which does not prevent one from enjoying the story and appreciating the people in it; but it was when I read them in French that I saw what I had lost. The conversations have that piquancy which French alone can give. Let me advise those who wish to reread these books in the original to get them in the cheap and attractive Nelson series, nine small volumes printed in clear type and attractively bound. For those who cannot read French, I recommend the new edition in one volume by Appleton, which contains the original pictures. The best appreciation of this romance and the best appraisal of the character of D'Artagnan may be found in Stevenson's essays in *Memories and Portraits,* called *A Gossip on a Novel of Dumas's.* Stevenson shows that while this story amuses, it also inspires.

7. *David Copperfield* (1849-1850) by CHARLES DICKENS.

To my mind Dickens is the greatest English novelist because he made the largest contribution and because he is irreplaceable. Should the works of any other disappear, we could find a substitute, which, while not perhaps "just as good," might serve. But who could take the place of Dickens? He produced an astonishing number of masterworks, and never had a barren period. From *Pickwick Papers,* written in the twenties, to *Edwin Drood,* which he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

left unfinished, his genius had free and full expression. We have outgrown him in only one respect. Sentimental pathos, which was fashionable in the fifties, was his weak point. Little Paul and Little Nell are overworked.

But his spontaneous humor, his power of characterization, his skill in construction, his glowing style are sufficiently in evidence in everything he wrote. It is absurd to call him a caricaturist, for he has created more living characters than any other novelist, and they live because they are human. On the whole, I put *Copperfield* first among his books, because it has more of him. The best essay on Dickens is to be found in George Santayana's *Soliloquies in England* (1922).

8. *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) by NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.

If one were lecturing to a class of pupils who had never read a novel, and wished to make it clear to them what particular kind of art is represented by the word, the best illustration that could be found would conceivably be *The Scarlet Letter*. It is impeccable. The evolution of the story is as perfect as a flower; the characters are set before the reader in full completeness; the style is as near perfection as seems possible; the intensity of the tragedy is felt by all readers, young and old. No one can read a dozen pages without coming under the spell, and no one can outgrow the book.

9. *Henry Esmond* (1852) by WILLIAM MAKEPEACE THACKERAY.

I have never shared the feeling, avowed by so many, who first read Dickens, and then Thackeray, that the latter drives the former out of existence. I wonder if this is as common an experience as apparently it used to be. "My wife," said Carlyle, "says that Thackeray beats Dickens out of the world." Professor Beers said that as a young man, when he began to read Thackeray, the new man drove

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dickens out of his head as one nail drives out another. If I could have only one of the two, I would choose Dickens; but I am thankful to have both, nor do I see any reason for placing them in comparison.

Just as I like Dickens' historical romance, *A Tale of Two Cities,* the least of all his works, so I prefer *Esmond* even to *Vanity Fair* and *Pendennis,* and like it infinitely better than *The Newcomes,* which I do not like at all. Trackeray produced *Esmond* in one volume without any serial publication; it is the most unified of his works, written with the most zest, and filled with the most impressive scenes. It is a brilliant performance. George Saintsbury said there were five heroines of nineteenth century fiction he would have been happy to marry: Elizabeth Bennet, of *Pride and Prejudice;* Di Vernon, of *Rob Roy;* Beatrix Esmond; Argemone Lavington, of *Yeast;* Barbara Grant, of *David Balfour.* I think Beatrix would have interfered considerably with his professorial duties.

10. *Madame Bovary* (1857) by GUSTAVE FLAUBERT.

Robert Browning read this when it appeared, and it was his "favorite novel." It remained so, though he never recovered from his disappointment in reading *Salammbô,* which has all the marks of pseudo-masterpieces, like near-beer. In view of the books now written in America for Americans and by Americans, it seems strange that *Madame Bovary* was suppressed in France. The trial was a *cause celèbre,* if ever there was one. Henry James said it would make an admirable book for American Sunday-schools, and while Mr. James knew more about French fiction than he know about Sunday-schools, he did justice to the truth, honesty, and sincerity of this story. Here is a book containing not a single character worthy of admiration, not one whom we should like to have as an acquaintance; the environment would make Main Street seem exciting; but the story is unforgettable because we know it is true.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One winter day in Rouen, I thought I would buy a copy as a souvenir of the scenes it describes. I visited the book-shops, and there was not a copy to be found; finally, on returning to the largest, I told the proprietor he must have one somewhere, and he said, No, there was no demand for it; but that he had amongst his treasures a copy of the first edition, which of course I would not care for, as the price was so high. (And yet he must have known I was an American). I asked to see it,—it was genuine. In an awestruck whisper, he informed me the price was twelve francs. I still have it.

11. *Fathers and Children* (1861) by IVAN S. TURGENEV.

Of all novelists, Turgenev is the foremost artist, for he never wrote a faulty book. George Moore says he is the greatest artist since antiquity, and he ought to know. The outline of his stories is as perfect as Greek sculpture. Through the translations, one can almost hear the style of the original,—almost, but not quite. In his prose fictions, Turgenev somehow had the qualities belonging to music and painting. No novelist ever succeeded more admirably in combining truth and beauty.

In this book, which everyone ought to reread just now, when so much is being said about the younger generation, Turgenev brought fathers and children together in a manner that, while intensely contemporary, is also ageless, for the same thing happens in every country and at every period. Here he coined the word "nihilist." The best proof of the honesty and faithfulness of the book is the fact that both old and young attacked it. Bazarof is an immortal figure; but I like best of all the portrait of his parents. The pictures of the old couple visiting the tomb is a revelation of the author's heart, and I suppose there never was a more beautiful personality than Turgenev.

12. *Les Misérables* (1862) by VICTOR HUGO.

Although among the French, Hugo ranks highest as a lyric poet, it is by this novel that he conquered the world. Jean Valjean is a character that will live as long as literature; and everybody knows Javert, Fantine, Cosette,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marius, Gavroche, old Gillenormand, Thénardier, and his terrific wife. It seems strange enough that these people had no existence until Victor Hugo put them on paper.

Very few novels have so many "supreme moments." Hugo had vitality enough for ten men, and when he wrote this book he had what the Methodists used to call "liberty." Let me urge those who have not read *Les Misérables* since their youth to read it again. You will recover all the early enthusiasm, plus much.

13. *Anna Karenina* (1873-1876) by LEO N. TOLSTOI.

I know that there are many who prefer *War and Peace,* but I don't. If I had to name the greatest novel ever written, I would name *Anna Karenina.* It is interesting to remember that Tolstoi would have destroyed both this and *War and Peace,* if he could. He professed to be ashamed that he had ever written them, and preferred his later writings on religion, morals, and politics. What an enormous difference there is between the artist Tolstoi and the moralist! As artist he is always right. No passion is too colossal, no caprice too trivial, to be beyond his reach. To read *Anna Karenina* is simply to live, and live abundantly.

But in other spheres Tolstoi became quite plainly mad. His spiritual teaching in his short parables is indeed beautiful, and has had a universal influence; but his practical propositions, such as abolishing law-courts, police, and private property are insane. I have intense sympathy for his wife. He was to be left free to write, and she was to take care of the house-work, the children, and the expenses with no receipts. Read her recently published diary, and judge for yourself.

In *Anna Karenina,* Tolstoi lifted fiction to a higher plane. One is overwhelmed by the truthfulness of the characters, conversations, and scenes. All the younger writers of Russia,—Chekhov, Gorki, Andreev, Artsybashev, Kuprin,—have been his disciples in art, and have done their best to follow his manner. It is curious that one who was so wholly Russian as Tolstoi should by his novels have made the whole world kin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

14. *The Brothers Karamazov* (1879-1880) by FEDOR M. DOSTOEVSKI.

If Dickens is a horizontal novelist, covering an enormous surface of men and manners, Dostoevski is vertical. He plunges into depths below the lowest yet explored; he rises to heights where no other could live. He holds the altitude record. Although *Crime and Punishment* is the most popular, there is no doubt in my mind that the greatest of his works is *The Brothers Karamazov,* first completely translated into English by Constance Garnett, who has given us such admirable versions of Turgenev, Tolstoi, Gogol, and Chekhov.

His specialty is the abnormal. He is like a composer who would require a new piano, with all the bass lower and all the treble higher than that shown on a Steinway. His work abounds in grotesque defects, in excrescences, in doldrums; there is no steady illumination as in Turgenev; he reveals truth by flashes of lightning. The family history of the Karamazovs will teach us much about the Russians, much about humanity, and a great deal about ourselves that hitherto we had not even suspected.

15. *Huckleberry Finn* (1884) by MARK TWAIN.

It may be too soon to place this work among the fifteen, but its steadily growing fame has all the signs of permanence. Here is America, its authentic voice. This is an epic of the Mississippi River, and no one who has ever read *Huck* will see the Mississippi or read its name without thinking of the raft. Tom Sawyer, Huck Finn, and Jim are representative specimens, true in everything except small-boy coarseness in conversation, which cannot possibly be printed, but which everybody knows. It is full of drama,—tragedy and mirth. The feud, the drunken Boggs and the mob scene, the dead-beats at the funeral,—no one but Mark Twain could have produced such things.

He is unique in American literature as Dickens is in English, and the world has made up its mind that it cannot possibly get along without him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BACKWASH

By ZONA GALE

I

IS there a case for feminism? The author of "Miss Lulu Bett" is so surprised that the question should be raised at this late date, that she is almost inclined to treat it as a sign of a radical swing of the pendulum back to Victorianism. Dr. Gina Lombroso's new book suggested this terse but entirely good-humored essay.

TO the observer of movements, both the beat of their advance and the contemporary opposition by them stimulated are more understandable than their backwash. Or call it merely the tread of those who do not know what has taken place and are still marching. On the Wisconsin prairie lived an old man who at family prayers began asking in 1860 for the liberation of the slaves, never changing, to the day of his death in the '80's, the form of his after-breakfast petition: "O God, set free the colored men and women of Thy South." By 1880 this plea seemed an anachronism comparable to that of any treatise of to-day beginning, "Spinning has gone out of the home," and pursuing an argument for woman's suffrage. Or to opposing woman's rights "because men and women are different."

Such a performance after the fact gives a biographical slant on the author far more revelatory than contemporary combat. For example, although we enjoy reading Daniel Webster's speech opposing to the Congress the opening up of the West, warning of the rock-bound coast of the Pacific, its poor harbors, its sterility, its impassable mountains at the end of a skeleton-strewn desert, and crying: "I would not see one dollar of the nation's money spent to bring the coast of the Pacific ocean one mile nearer to Boston"; yet that dead utterance has for us no sensation comparable to our amusement if, say, President Warren Harding should at this moment suggest that God and Nature never did mean the Pacific coast to be in entangling alliance with the At-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lantic seaboard and that for the western slopes of the Rockies the proper destiny is a splendid isolation.

Or if the British should now decide that King John was wrong, and if Lord Curzon and Mr. Winston Churchill should sponsor a movement to declare Magna Charta mere campaign material, this would be, on the whole, far more diverting than if these two had been alive to join in the contemporary opposition to that rebellion, when certain barons came pulling at their forelocks and saying, "Far be it from us to vote with our betters!"

Also one hundred and fifty years after Lexington and Concord we have Mr. Mencken, Mr. Hergesheimer, and others declaring themselves in favor of monarchy who may be said to have all the advantage, in humor and other respects, over the specific values which the fathers bestowed upon the local monarchists of 1776.

And even a more perfect instance is that of Mr. William Jennings Bryan so abruptly embattled against our peaceful evolutionary law. We, who had ceased to think of Jonah, and to compute how high the heavens would have had to be to escape the topless tower of Babel times, are now thrown back to forgotten physiological and geometrical speculation in heartier laughter than Mr. Darwin or Mr. Wallace can ever have known.

Perfect types of the backwash, these.

II

And now another: The Reflections on Life of Signora Gina Lombroso, D.L., M.D., daughter of the Italian anthropologist, Cesare Lombroso, wife of Guglielmo Ferrero,—reflections entitled, "The Soul of Woman" (Dutton), and presenting to a world, now pretty well suffragized, so to say, the bright contention that woman's place is in the home.

One focuses upon the book the eye of desire not to know its contents, with which we have so long been familiar, but to know what it means that anybody should be writing an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-feminist book now; to know whether this is a new revolt of the intellectuals, or whether it is an echoed cry of the woman of our American South who wrote to an anti-suffragist in the North: "We are against suffrage. Come down and tell us why."

"*L'Anima della Donna.*" Not for nothing has the book's title the languor and the orientalism of the South. One is tempted to say: "A woman of Italy, hard by Algiers, by Morocco, and even by Turkey, to whom the *anima della donna* is assuredly in a dulcimer and her destiny waiting beyond a lattice." But remembering the feminists of Turkey and of Egypt, one looks deeper because of them, and learns, in the epistle dedicatory and in the preface, that the object of the book is twofold. In the former, which is "To Nina": "May these pages, my dearest heart, spare you some of the suffering in store for us all."

With the mutual exclusiveness in this statement of a very natural desire it is impossible to cope at all, and one presses on: "My object is to try to determine women's aptitudes, aspirations, qualities, and defects and point to the conclusions which society would draw from these premises." Although both aptitudes and defects may be considered qualities, and although none of the three are premises, the intent is clear and commendable, albeit not wholly uncharted.

To Dr. Lombroso's aim we come in a half dozen words. It is "to combat the tendency to masculinize women." And with Dr. Lombroso herself we are face to face in her prefactory peroration: "And it is particularly to you, humble mothers, devoted to your mission in life, it is to you that I turn, and to you, young girls, whose hearts are already heaving with longing to hold a little child in your arms. Oppressed, crushed, bewildered by all the talk of woman's great social and political mission, you stand aside, hiding, almost, as if ashamed to be so different from all the others. Your hesitation is mistaken for indifference, your passion for narrow-mindedness, your function in the world is contested, you are called the deluded victims of an ancient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order of things. I am writing to defend you, to prove that you still exist, and that the yoke from which they are trying to emancipate you holds your real mission, that universal aspiration common to all women who know what it is to love."

Not even the good Queen Victoria herself was ever more explicit than that.

Here, still more explicitly, are samples of Dr. Lombroso's anti-feminism:

"Love absorbs the woman at all hours of the day, at every minute of the hour and every day of her life, and this is why in her all other feelings and ambitions are excluded."

"The feminine conception of love as devotion, esteem, admiration is the corner stone of the family, for it is this which renders affection firm and lasting, a thing it could not be if the woman's ideal corresponded with that of the man."

"Woman, who is weak and timid, wants to feel protected, and she imagines that the domineering man will use his authority and his force to protect her. Under the present system, which considers reciprocal independence the roof of love, one gets to the point where the members of the family do not care what the others do or think and where woman feels abandoned and ends by becoming corrupted. Tired of the reciprocal indifference, she is led to seek outside the family someone who will give her the illusion of utilizing her better, that is, of directing her and ordering her about. . . . What we must have are laws and traditions which shall regulate the collaboration possible between man and woman, which shall lead the one to understand the other, and both to understand themselves and realize their reciprocal differences."

Here is her conception of feminism:

"Is it permissible to sacrifice most women worthy of esteem, as well as the future of society, in order to better the situation of a few women whose virility, furthermore, is their best defence? . . . Society would suddenly be trans-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed into a collection of people thinking only of satisfying their own desires to the detriment of the highest type of women who cannot be transformed into men by decree and who cannot be made to enjoy, because of a decree, the selfish advantages held out to them."

"Why should woman disdain love, which in reality is her supreme aspiration, and the deference and protection of man, which gives her so much pleasure?"

Here is her comment on woman's mentality:

"Suffering is woman's school. Woman does not think nor does she meditate except when she suffers or sees other people suffer, or when she loves or wants to be loved. The highest type of woman cannot see life as it is, nor can she love without suffering." (And on the next page.) "It is because she sees things as they are that the highest type of woman knows how to distinguish real genius from spurious genius, fundamentally good ideas from those which merely appear good. . . . The highest type of woman sees life as it is, but most of those around her do not."

"But if a woman cannot be guided by her reasoning power, by what can she be guided? I think by the same things that both men and women have instinctively set up as guides, namely, examples, traditions, ideals, and authoritative commands."

And on her education: "I am not opposed to the idea of sending girls to *boys' schools.*" (The italics are not hers.)

And on the ethics of women:

"I have never heard a woman, not even the most hardened criminal, admit as so many men do, that she has done wrong. No woman ever believes that her faults are faults, and reason, instead of helping her to see her faults, frequently adds to her blindness. . . . When a woman makes use of her reasoning power to settle a matter of conscience, she uses it not to refrain from doing a given thing, but in order to have a reason for doing it, which, instead of making things better, makes them worse."

". . . in the feminine code, everything which can cause

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suffering to others, and which can be avoided, is unjust; everything that can give happiness without harming anyone is just, and consequently legal. . . . She feels no regret for actions which, even though in violation of the law, give or can give happiness. . . . Not only do the codified laws mean nothing to woman, but she enjoys and even takes pride in violating them whenever it is a question of giving pleasure or avoiding suffering for others."

On the other hand: "Her greatness springs from a combination of great heart and mind. . . . She must have imagination, delicacy; she must be able to judge the present and have a clear view of the future so as to be able to guide others firmly and surely. . . . In short her superiority consists in a sort of general and harmonious development of heart and mind which enables her to temper morality with beauty, justice with kindness, abstraction with reality and to harmonize the chaotic progress which springs from man's abstract genius with the various differences and tendencies inherent in every country."

No inferiority complex there, in spite of her estimate of the "feminine code." Evidently, that code and greatness need not conflict.

But then, here is her opinion of the general code:

"All, men and women, lie so easily even when they have given their word, even when they have put their desires into writing!"

Quotations are never fair. On the other hand, one can savor a barrel of liquid with a straw. This barrel is the argument from nature,—there is the book in a word. After years of domestication "the bull remains wild while the cow is peaceful; the rooster is combative while the hen is docile"; and "why should not similar tendencies exist in the most perfect race, the human race?" Also, "If there were no differences they would have to be created, for this diversity corresponds to a general necessity," and so on.

With the cocked hat, that it is our business to improve on nature, and that we've done it, and that we're doing it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again, we are not here concerned. We are concerned only with the deduction that this book is not the record of a new revolt, but of the immemorial protected-woman psychology, and rather more cynical about women than ever.

We are concerned only with that deduction,—and yet one wonders irresistibly how clearly the general reader of this book will be able to contrast for himself this view with the actual view of the feminist. With her simple code of honor and collaboration between men and women. Equal rights and equal scrupulousness. It is the code of another planet,—of our planet as it might be. It seems ungracious to say about a book which has been prepared with so much care, and especially for an American reviewer to say it, that Dr. Lombroso is fighting from the back of a dead dragon, while before her, in such a book as Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "Woman and Economics," comes the sun, "a mile high and shining."

III

But now, what if this book did express a new revolt against the woman's new point of view, against "feminism"? It is plainly not a new revolt, but what if it were? Just as certain intellectuals have, in the speed of their progress, again reached a taste for monarchy, so other intellectuals, young and scornful of aspiration, may prick along through their flair for freedom in life and love, and arrive at this identical Victorian conclusion, that the sole self expression for women is love. Already, in co-educational talk, there are signs of such a return, saved, so far, by self-consciousness and humor; or, where it burns brightest, given a new face by a light self-conscious scorn for marriage.

But, posing as intellectual revolt from revolt, here, in a new dress, is perhaps that old idea of immolation, of self-identification with the male. The young college intellectuals have their eyes open to feminism, ten out of ten of them are feminists, but in the terrible *malaise* of the world, they may turn against feminism as democrats turn against democracy, as certain Americans turn against the Ameri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

canism of constitutional rights. What if, in their desire to explore, they find Baudelaire not enough and dip back to Petruchio's Kate?

The anti-feminist as anti-feminist doesn't matter, never will matter again; but the youthful feminist as anti-feminist, riding a backwash, will matter rather more; just as it matters enormously that this same group, in Europe and America, have since the war announced their freedom to cut the dykes. If, in our hackneyed confusion, the youthful feminist turned anti-feminist, what then?

What then? Perhaps a sign of health, such as is in the present-day fashion of the young intellectuals of using the word "noble" as a term of opprobrium. Any intimation of idealism, any hint of belief in marriage (of course they marry, but to say that they believe in it is another matter), any toleration for the past is met by the warning: "Don't be noble." And one hears: "What's so-and-so like?" "Oh, pretty noble," which bears the connotation of a shrug. And this is not a mere expression of ennui at the complacence of another, at any personal admissions of nobility. It is a vast self-conscious tolerance of our "nobility" itself, of racial and religious nobilities, the dicta of whose banner-bearers have for so long borne no relation whatever to actual behavior. This shrug at the "noble" is, if one understands it, one of the forces of to-day.

If this new cosmic intolerance of the idealism which hasn't worked does sweep and sweep out, temporarily, some of the real and ultimate leaven,—democracy, co-operation, feminism, or any other valid idealism,—we shall understand. And we shall not be afraid that, faced at last with any authentic machinery to express the slow racial rise which not even our absurdities trouble too much, the young intellectuals will not accept it. Accept it, perhaps, as a new revolt!

If only the principles of Jesus were now first enunciated! Even as it is, the young intellectuals may discover them any day,—young intellectual men and women alike.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORLD'S LATENT ENERGY

A Plain Talk About Atoms and Electrons

By CHARLES HENRY MELTZER

IS the world in danger of being annihilated by clumsy handling of the great natural source of energy, which is as yet imprisoned in matter? A layman gives some account of what we may expect when scientists succeed in releasing and applying "electronic force."

LORD KELVIN was once visiting a northern town; and, in his honor, an admiring Dominie had planned an oral examination. To show off his pupils' knowledge, he asked whether any boy could tell the famous scientist what electricity was. One bright lad raised his hand. But it was not his turn.

"Well, sir," at last said the good schoolmaster, "what is electricity?"

"Please, sir," replied the boy, "I have forgotten."

"Too bad, too bad," exclaimed Lord Kelvin, sadly, "And he is probably the only chap who knew."

This anecdote may have recurred to many who are curious to learn what the wise ones know about the great, strange, new force which is to save or destroy us. I call it for convenience, a "new" force, but the existence of this special form of energy has, for years past, not been a secret to our scientists.

The force in question is concealed in minute particles of matter termed electrons; and to laymen it is still at most a name. Distinguished scientists have written pamphlets on this wondrous natural agency. But they have wrapped up their meanings in cryptic formulæ.

It was not without submitting to snubs that I was able to get side lights thrown on the mystery. My investigations were regarded as the vain gropings of a weak and foolish child. Yet surely laymen might be pardoned for some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human curiosity as to what they and the world could hope or fear of a potentiality which, as some have declared, might smash the universe.

From time to time, alone on their high towers, astronomers have chronicled the quick blotting out in space of what seemed planets. It has been hinted, if not argued, more than once of late, that these startling disappearances may have been due to the misuse, by unknown scientists in other spheres, of what I have called tentatively the electronic force. Mere guesswork, and possibly nonsense, but painfully suggestive to the layman.

At a recent meeting of the British Association, in Edinburgh, electrons and their relationship to atoms were discussed at length. We learned that all matter was made up of one single mother substance, a combination of minute positive and negative particles of electricity, which attracted and repelled one another. The positive particles had been christened "protons," while the negative particles were called "electrons."

We also learned that the stability of matter, the persistence of the universe itself, was due to the inter-relationship of the positives and the negatives. The disturbance of the balance by which protons and electrons neutralized one another, might spell calamity.

We were told much about the good that might result if the great force were only harnessed. But, if the force were in clumsy hands? What then?

It comforted me slightly to be told in London a short time ago, by no less an authority than Sir Robert Hadfield, that there was no immediate danger to humanity from the new force.

"The so-called scientists," he said, "who prate about the disruption of the universe by electronic energy are talking bosh. Nature moves slowly, and this universe of ours has endured for aeons. If Faraday came back to us and saw how electricity has developed since his day, he might regard it as a terrifying agency."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sir Ernest Rutherford, like Sir Oliver Lodge and others to whom I addressed myself, objects to discussing science from the layman's point of view. No one knows more about the electronic force than he, not even Moseley or Soddy or our own Millikan. Rutherford and Lodge have made wonderful revelations. But both these wise men have a hateful way of proclaiming what they know in terms of algebra!

One fact, however, does stand out: the fact that, in the course of experiments in the Cavendish Laboratory, at Cambridge University, the internal energy of the electron was "tapped and measured."

But, to go back to the beginning. What is an electron? Not some new-fangled kind of reading lamp, not some strange hair wash, or breakfast food.

According to Sir William Bragg, and others, the electron is "nature's unit of electricity," and the smallest of all particles of matter yet discovered. The atom has been overhauled, probed, subdivided. It is now known that atoms are composed of multitudes of protons and electrons; all, of course, imperceptible to the most powerful microscope. The electronic force (some name it atomic force) apparently resides only in what scientists have called the nucleus, or proton; a minute positive particle around which revolve negative electrons, much as the planets move around the sun.

Professor J. W. Nicholson, of Balliol College, Oxford, obliged me with this explanation:

"The atom is a miniature solar system. In this system the positive electron, or nucleus, is as the sun, with a positive charge of electricity. It is surrounded by negative electrons which revolve around it. But negative electrons repel one another whereas planets attract one another. The proportion of negative to positive electrons,—that is, of electrons to protons,—in atoms varies. In the atom of hydrogen, the lightest so far known, there are eighteen hundred negative electrons. The atom of oxygen has fourteen times,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the atom of radium has two hundred and twenty-four times, the atom of uranium has two hundred and thirty-six times, the mass of the hydrogen atom."

When atoms group themselves to form higher or more complex forms of matter, the resulting aggregations are named molecules. In order to form troops, they lose part of their motion, come closer together, and revolve around one another, constituting entities called compounds. As they combine, the atoms give out light and heat; light being a wave movement in the ether, and heat a molecular motion.

Matter is now regarded as composed of positive and negative electricity. The negative particles are the so-called electrons, the electron being the ultimate unit of electricity. This unit is infinitely small, light, and mobile. Two and a half million million electrons, each placed in contact with its neighbor, would extend only over a distance of one centimeter. As to its mass, a thousand million, million, million electrons weigh only a single grain.

Very little is yet clear as to the composition of the proton. But from an experiment of Rutherford, who broke up the nitrogen atom into hydrogen and helium, it seems probable that it is itself partly made up of negative electrons.

The problem with which scientists in many lands are at this moment wrestling is as to whether it is impossible to let loose the energy contained in positive electrons,—the protons or nuclei of atoms. The German physicists and chemists, we may be sure, have not neglected the experiments of Lodge and Rutherford, of Bragg and Millikan and Soddy. What they are up to we can only guess. (The mysterious explosion which took place at Oppau set many thinking). That they are up to something, who can doubt? Something inspired by the old, kindly dream of "Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles."

Sir Robert Hadfield treats the question lightly. But within the past ten years, we have seen many prodigies. We shiver as we read of the tremendous radio-activity which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is supposed to be packed, somehow, in the proton. This radio-activity is due to "the rebellion of an atomic nucleus against over-packing of constituent positive and negative electrons, with the positives in a great majority." For elements of positive electricity must repel one another, and can only be held together by the presence of negatives. If the positives preponderate too greatly, the negatives can no longer keep the peace. This sounds alarming, if rather vague. But to scientists it means much.

A faint notion of the force may be divined when it is said that the energy of the electrons massed in a tiny piece of chalk might be sufficient to drive the Leviathan across the Atlantic, or to hoist a battleship from the sea to the summit of Mount Everest. It might enable terrifically quick projectiles, of enormous size, to be fired from monstrous guns, and shatter the most mighty citadels. If,—a big "if,"—some process could be hit on! Heaven only knows how many minds are at this moment straining to find out how to detach negative electrons in great quantities from protons. Sir Ernest Rutherford has so far succeeded only in detaching two or three; which in effect is negligible.

Some good, though, has already been accomplished. Sir William Bragg not long ago laid stress on the immense importance of the electron in mechanics. Thanks to the study of electrons, he declared, "We are now able to express quantitatively laws and relations which have hitherto been matters of mere surmise." The whole world of experimental physics "is now full of a new life; and, when an advance is made in the realm of physics, all other natural sciences must feel the impulse."

Before scoffing at electrons, the massed tiniest particles yet known of matter, we must learn what mass means in the modern electrical theory. According to Professor Nicholson, "we can observe and measure the mass of matter only in bulk; and this matter consists of a vast concourse of positive and negative units of electricity, practically equal in total amount, and thus neutralizing one another and provid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing no outside electrical effects, from ordinary matter, which we can experience, or even measure with delicate instruments in the laboratory."

The mass of matter is the total added mass of all the electric charges which compose it. This, after all, we can perceive and measure. In all cases in which what British physicists call "statistical phenomena" appear, we may lose sight of the real genesis of these phenomena. The ultimate constituents of matter,—positive and negative electricity,—possess, however, certain properties. Some, as, for instance, mass, are found in both kinds and have only to be added together. Others are opposed and produce nothing observable, when the two kinds are equally represented. "Statistical phenomena" belong to a large concourse of units, and are a sort of average of those units.

All matter is made up of myriads of electrons. You, I, our dogs and cats, the air, the fields, are merely innumerable electrons grouped together. The number of electrons, or units of electricity, contained in any visible piece of matter, is almost incalculable. The mass they form can, on the other hand, be weighed and calculated.

Electricity and electrons may be said, in a rough way, to be synonymous. The transfer of electricity from point to point consists always in the transfer of electrons. The electric current is, as Sir William Bragg declares, a hurrying stream of electrons; and the electrons have a rythmic, spiral movement. Our electrical machinery concerns itself with setting electrons in motion, giving them energy, and then withdrawing it. Till lately it had not been found possible to make them move fast enough, in spaces sufficiently empty of air and other gases, to measure their mass and charges. It is speed which gives separate existence to moving electrons; and it is also speed, it seems, which betrays their presence to us.

The terrific force of electrons caused by the disintegration of the radium atom is now known and proved. But great scientists are searching for elements more powerful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and deadly than radium, and studying wave movements of ether in their effect on matter, with a view to shaking loose the electrons from certain materials, and thus producing new beneficent or maleficent energies.

There seems no limit to the amazing possibilities of the electronic force. It has already, we are told, helped in the solution of the problem of wireless telephony. By combinations of electrons we may some day find it possible to transmute all metals, to transform harmful into useful substances, to improve travel by increasing the rapidity of our transportation, to dispense with coal and oil and devise new kinds of heat and light. And only a few years ago the world had hardly heard of electrons. The atom was supposed to be the smallest of existing forms of matter.

There are two kinds of electronic energy,—the available and non-available kinds. The first is the energy concerned in the keeping, in close proximity, of the planetary electrons and the nucleus, the usual distance between an electron and a nucleus being about one hundred millionth of a centimetre. Chemical changes and combustions are a result of the detachment of one or more of those electrons, and heat generated in a chemical change is an instance of electronic energy becoming available. If they could all be removed, a quite remarkable amount of energy would be produced, even in a single atom. To remove, electrically, the single electron from a hydrogen atom requires a potential gradient of about twenty volts in a centimetre, and the difficulty of removing successive electrons from a complex atom increases on a sort of "compound interest" plan, till millions of volts could not remove many electrons,—as we are assured,—from, say, a sodium atom.

But the energy concerned here, great though it may be, is as nothing in comparison with that which is, at present, completely unavailable. This is the energy locked up in the nucleus, and involved in its tight packing.

The breaking off of any bit of a nucleus,—say, the shooting off of a negative electron as a B particle, or of a positively charged particle as an X-ray, constitutes radio-activity; and it represents the fact that nuclear arrangement has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

become unstable, overloaded with positive or negative, or of such a nature that the velocities of the charges are so stupendous in their tiny orbits in the atomic structure that one shoots off at a tangent.

That the energy involved in these nuclear phenomena transcends anything of which we have experience is shown by the fact that nothing we can now do by the application of intense heat, or of great electrical force, or any other ordinary mechanical agency, can make the slightest direct impression on a nucleus, or cause it to become more or less radio-active (or inclined to shoot off particles) than it was before.

Happily, it may be, for humanity, scarcely any of this energy is yet available. And why? First, because we cannot now release it from the atom by any known means except that lately discovered by Sir Ernest Rutherford, who, by bombarding atoms with what are technically termed B particles from a radio-active atom, has been able to let loose other B particles, but not on a scale which would be of the slightest interest, in practice, to power experts.

Next, even if we could set free the energy, we could not, in the present state of our knowledge, lay hold of it. An electron treats everything in its path like a sieve with very large holes; and a stream of so called B particles, which are merely very fast electrons, cannot be captured by the gross agencies just now at our disposal.

But what may happen in a hundred years from now? Say what they will, those scientists who would limit the potentialities of creative or inventive minds are only guessing. Things which, two centuries or more ago, would have been ascribed to black magic, have now become matter of course. In Paris, for example, a doctor of recognized standing has, under the surveillance of expert confreres, succeeded in mummifying a dead hand, which he now uses in his study as a paper-weight.

Professor Frederick Soddy of Oxford believes it probable that electronic energy will one day do the labor of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world. But he adds: "Should that day ever arrive, let no one suppose that such an acquisition to the physical resources of humanity can safely be entrusted to those who in the past have converted into a curse the blessings already conferred by science."

What could protect the world against the evil use of this great force? What could prevent some human fiend from blotting out a race he abhorred? Law would be laughed at by a man who could by a turn of the wrist lay the earth in ruins.

The scientists have suggested a variety of annihilations for this world of ours,—all gloomy to contemplate. We have been told it will go up in smoke; we have also been told that our descendants will freeze. Now there is a prospect of sudden and sure destruction by clumsy manipulation of a vague new force. Perhaps in fifty or a hundred or a thousand or ten thousand years!

The universe may have endured for aeons; but none the less it does go forward. *Eppur si muove.* And the volcanoes have given us hints of what it can accomplish when roused.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TORY AND THE PRIMARY

By GEORGE HENRY PAYNE

THE efforts of ultra-conservative elements in the two political parties to do away with the direct primary and revert to the convention method of selecting candidates are here shown to be in sinister opposition to the best American traditions of self-government.

BEHIND the economic issues which are dividing the Republican and Democratic parties into blocs and camps, more vigorously armed for internecine warfare than they are for their historic and regular conflict, lies the fundamental question of how far the wishes of the people are directly to affect legislation. In both parties there are radicals,—if anything there are more in the Republican party than there are in the Democratic party, due to the fact that the West is nominally Republican. In both parties there are conservatives,—again, if anything, there are more in the Republican party than in the Democratic, due to the fact that the conservative East has been Republican on so many issues naturally attractive to the business interests.

The curious anomaly exists of the conservatives in both parties trying to make their party *the* Conservative party, while the radical element in both parties,—led in the one case by Mr. Bryan and in the other by Mr. LaFollette,—are working with might and main and much shrewdness to make their respective parties *the* Radical party.

In between the radicals and conservatives is the body of citizens who go to make for success at the polls, who leave their own party when it becomes too radical,—as the Democrats did in 1896 and 1900,—or when it becomes too conservative, as happened in the ranks of the Republicans in 1912. Party alignments have indeed become so meaningless that if it were not for the offices at stake it would be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult to find and define what was once the most familiar thing in American political life: the party organization.

As principles and reasons for the parties have disappeared, those interested solely in offices have made a strenuous endeavor to combine the machinery by and through which offices are filled. Those who are at all familiar with the practical side of American politics know that it is very seldom that the practical politicians are afflicted with any philosophy or moved by any consciousness of the needs of the situation. What progress they make is accomplished in the manner of the beetle that bumps its head against the four sides of the room until it finally arrives at the exit.

This quality was once forcibly exemplified by Mr. Herbert Parsons, an astute New York politician whose failure to achieve distinction might be traced to his inability to settle in his own mind whether he was a conservative or a liberal. A conference, as I recall the incident, was arranged between Mr. Parsons, then a dominating factor in New York Republican politics and Mr. Frank Hendricks of Syracuse, the trivial matter that was to be settled by these two intellectual gentlemen being nothing less than the Governorship of the State of New York,—with a population of ten million.

As I recall Mr. Parsons' anecdote, these two statesmen or bosses sat in a room in a hotel for three hours. At intervals Mr. Parsons would say,

"I'm fur Hughes fur Governor," and Mr. Hendricks would reply,

"I'm agin him," or words to that effect.

At the end of this intellectual debate, Mr. Hendricks finally succumbed, giving in, not as a tribute to Mr. Hughes' qualifications for the Governorship, but in deference to the superior sagacity of his fellow boss. Out of that portentous agreement, Charles Evans Hughes became,—or was elected,—Governor of the State of New York, with a population of ten million.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1912 I had a personal illustration of the way the old system worked. The Progressive party had been formed and a convention was being held in the city of Syracuse to name a Governor. Inasmuch as the party was scarcely a month old there were, as yet, no bosses, although many were inclined to undertake the task. It was a curious gathering, this one in Syracuse: idealists of every type, friends and admirers of Roosevelt who knew nothing about politics, college professors, reformers, and a sprinkling of "soreheads" from both the Democratic and Republican camps, men who had failed to get along with their organizations, and saw an opportunity of working in at the top. Among the latter was a Tammany leader who had had a quarrel with Mr. Murphy and had immediately become a fervent believer in the new liberal party.

As we entered the Convention hall to ballot on the candidate for Governor, I asked the ex-Tammany man, who was also a delegate, if he would cast his vote for my friend, Mr. Bainbridge Colby, whom I was anxious to see nominated.

"Is he organization?" asked my ex-Tammany friend.

"We're all organization," I replied, a little stupified at this old-time question in this atmosphere of idealism and purified politics.

"How do the leaders stand on him?" persisted Mr. Ex-Tammany.

I explained to the best of my ability that in this new party I assumed we were all starting evenly, that the leaders or bosses did not as yet exist, and that we as delegates should vote in accordance with our own best judgment.

"But I'm regular," insisted the ex-Tammany man, "and I shall wait until the word is passed."

Again I explained that, at least theoretically, and as far as I could see, there was no one actually to pass the word.

"Oh! they'll slip it to us somehow," was his dogged reply, and I realized then that to have made my friend a real reformer in politics, it would have been necessary to have gone back at least a generation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the old conservative days those who made politics a business fought desperately for the control of the machinery because there was a large proportion of the citizens who ardently believed in their respective parties, and, given the direction of the machine, the bosses had simply to hold fast while the party was out of power, and when the party swelled in numbers they were swept into power and office.

Today the parties are regarded with indifference and party leaders with suspicion and even contempt. The voters are not inclined to accept the machine-made candidates with complacency and are more inclined to take a hand in the selection of their representatives. The result is not only a desperate endeavor on the part of the bosses to hold on to the machinery, but a determined effort to reduce the possibility of the people interfering with the fast disintegrating machinery. It is this that has led in many states to the movement to do away with the direct primary and return to the convention system.

The efforts of the bosses alone to destroy the return to the convention would amount to little. Backed, however, by the Tory element in both parties, and the other elements who either do not trust the voters or do not believe that they should have too strong a hand in legislation, or government for that matter,—this reactionary movement has assumed considerable proportions.

Strangely enough, this Toryism has not been confined to the East. Senator Borah is still fighting against the repeal in Idaho, while the radical movement in Minnesota, with the recent election of Magnus Johnson, may be traced in part to the action of the conservatives in that State in repealing the direct primary.

The curious thing is that all those who are earnestly and honestly engaged in this undertaking do not see that they are kicking against the pricks, and that as they endeavor to stem the tide of democracy in this one way they are only postponing the inundation. Even after the voters have shown they will not stand for a retrograde movement, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they did last year in New York State, the foes of the direct primary refuse to face the facts.

Governor Miller's defeat by "Al" Smith was ascribed by his friends to many causes, but not once did I hear one of them admit that his repeal of the primary had been instrumental. Yet there is not the slightest doubt that the primary repeal and the way in which he brought it about cost Miller several hundred thousand votes.

Professor Merriman has recently pointed out that the people in every case where they have had an opportunity have voted for the primary and against the Tory movement. In Montana in 1920 the vote was 77,000 to 60,000 against the convention system; in Nebraska, the repeal of the primary was defeated by a vote of 133,000 to 49,000, and in South Daokta the proposed combination of the convention system with the primary system was rejected by a vote of 82,000 to 65,000.

Guessing at what the American people will do at elections, and what political tendencies they will develop, is a national pastime in which all opinions are supposed to be of equal value. The historical review however, is apt to give us a fairer indication of what to many seems simply a haphazard venture.

Since 1800, or to be exact, 1801, when Jefferson became President, the American people have moved steadily forward in their democratic progress, and the direct primary is only one step in a long chain of events that practically began with the abolition of the property and religious qualifications for voters. The theory that a benevolent or intellectual few, or even a wealthy few, could better run the government than the people themselves lies back of the opposition to the primary. What is forgotten by the latter day Tories is that the agitation for a better nominating system did not arise until "fraud, bribery, trickery, and corruption" had become so common in all sections of the country as to arouse popular indignation.*

* See Merriman, The American Party System, pages 250-251.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The subservience of the bosses of both parties to large corporations brought about an intensive movement in 1900 in which Governor LaFollette of Wisconsin was one of the prime movers, but it was Governor Hughes who gave the movement its impetus in New York State.

It is usual for advocates of the convention system to say that the character of the public officials has fallen through the fact that men have to submit themselves to the enrolled voters rather than to the convention, where the wise and dignified leaders make the selection.

Any one who knows anything about conventions, as Charles Evans Hughes found out, knows that the idea that the "wisdom" of the party meets in a convention is a child-like fiction. I have been attending conventions of both parties now for nearly thirty years, and I have never attended one that was not dominated by a small group of men and frequently by one man.

Sometimes the selection, even when it was by a single boss as in the case of Senator Thomas C. Platt, was a good one and a wise one. But more frequently, the selection was decided by methods and motives that were not far from sinister. In any case, whether the results were good or bad, they were not the methods by which a self-governing people should be represented.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S PAGE

EDWARD BOK'S announcement of a hundred thousand dollar prize for a workable peace plan has stirred up almost as much midsummer excitement as President Meiklejohn's ejection from Amherst College and the election of Johnson the Great, dirt farmer of Minnesota, to the United States Senate.

Already thousands of brains that have never before given a second thought to foreign affairs are hatching new and ingenious schemes for making the United States useful not only to ourselves but to Europe and to mankind as well.

The most appealing new suggestion that has come to the Editors of THE FORUM, though not of the kind that the Bok Committee is likely to try out on the Senate, is to begin at the beginning and start backfires in the Middle West and indeed in every state, against our indifference to foreign affairs. It is a plan, at present only a dream, to set up in London a School of Journalism to which, as with the Rhodes Scholarships, American students of Journalism shall be sent annually, representing each state of the United States. In the senior class of every American college are students ambitious for newspaper careers, and what more profitable for them than a year of graduate study in a great European capital?

It is further suggested by Mr. Edwin O. Holter of New York, who offers this idea, that the School be not only a training ground for our ablest future newspaper men, but a memorial to the international services of America's one-time Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Walter Hines Page, and be called the PAGE SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM. As Mr. Page was from 1887 to 1895 Editor of this magazine, there is all the more reason for THE FORUM to welcome this thought and speed its realization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR ROSTRUM FOR AUGUST

Mr. Bryan's Rejoinder

Editor of THE FORUM:

I DID not know until after my article was in print that THE FORUM intended to submit it to one with opposing views, and print the answer in the same issue. I am pleased, however, that such action was taken, and am gratified that so able and representative an exponent of what Dr. Hillis calls "The New Religious Thinking" was selected for the task. There is no higher authority among the "Liberals," and he could not have presented Modernism more attractively. In availing myself of the privilege given me to make a rejoinder, I shall not offer any new arguments or answer the arguments presented by Dr. Hillis. I am perfectly willing to have the two articles appear side by side so that the readers of THE FORUM may compare them and weigh the facts presented. I will content myself with calling attention to the following points:

First: Dr. Hillis refers to what I have said at other times in regard to the principles and policies of Jefferson and Jackson. I do not know why he should desire to drag into a religious discussion differences of opinion that may exist between us in regard to political matters. Why not leave politics to be considered at the proper time?

Second: He charges me with believing that the world was made in six days,—evidently meaning days of twenty-four hours each. I do not know why he should have made such an assertion when I have never, in writing or in my speeches, said anything to justify such a charge. According to the interpretation placed upon it by orthodox Christians, the day mentioned in the account of creation was of indefinite duration. The only persons who talk about a twenty-four-hour day in this connection do so for the purpose of objecting to it; they build up a straw man to make the attack easier, as they do when they accuse orthodox Christians of denying the roundness of the earth, and the law of gravitation.

Third: Dr. Hillis admits that Darwin became an agnostic, but he attempts to explain it in such a way as to relieve the present-day followers of Darwin from the charge of having reached the same melancholy end, but he does not dispute the statement of Professor Leuba showing that a majority of the prominent scientists in the United States have gone farther astray even than Darwin, and rejected belief in a personal God and a personal immortality.

Fourth: It will be noticed that Dr. Hillis states his position on only two of the five propositions covered by the pronouncement of the Presby-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terian General Assembly. He seemingly rejects the inerrancy of the Bible, although the language which he employs does not clearly indicate the rule that he employs or the parts which he rejects or retains. He seems also to reject the doctrine that Christ's coming and death were sacrificial in character, but on three points he is silent. The reader must judge whether his silence is due to oversight or unwillingness to commit himself; in view of a like unwillingness on the part of so many other liberals, his reticence is presumably due to unwillingness rather than oversight.

Fifth: He does not say whether or not he believes in the virgin birth, or, if not, how he accounts for Christ's appearance. Those who reject the virgin birth usually regard Christ as the son of Joseph. It would be interesting to know Dr. Hillis' attitude on this subject and whether he thinks that Christ, robbed of the glory of a virgin birth, would exert as powerful an influence as he does when credited with the birth described by Luke and Matthew.

Sixth: Dr. Hillis also ignores the bodily resurrection of Christ. We can better understand his estimates of the Savior when we know whether he regards Easter services in celebration of the risen Lord as founded on fact or fable,—whether he thinks Christ's body still in the tomb.

Seventh: In like manner, Dr. Hillis has avoided commitment on the authenticity of Christ's miracles. Does "New Religious Thinking" require the rejection of all or any of the New Testament record of the miracles performed by the Master? Before the readers of THE FORUM can intelligently decide between the merits of orthodox Christianity and the merits of the "New Religious Thinking" they must know what the new thinkers are thinking,—what the new thinkers regard as consistent with the evolutionary hypothesis and what must be stricken from the Bible in order to make it acceptable to those who, measuring the Bible by some other standard which they regard as higher, condemn the Word of God as untrustworthy in spots.

I was sorry you used the word "Fundamentalist," because that name has been appropriated by an organization and, while I am in sympathy with most of their positions, I have not thought it wise to speak as a representative of any organization. The orthodox membership of the churches is very much larger than any organization, and I think the title, "Orthodox Christianity *vs.* Liberalism (or Modernism)," would have been much fairer heading for my article. You have allowed Mr. Hillis to use a subject which contains a reflection upon our position. When we use the word "liberalism" or "modernism" we use a word that our opponents use in describing themselves, but we do not use the word "dogma" or "dogmatists" in describing our position.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Communications From France

EVERY statesman and editor in France during the last few months has been called upon to explain what France is doing in the Ruhr. THE FORUM will take up the subject for debate in an early issue. From a mass of recent communications which have come to the Editor's desk in regard to the Ruhr, we have selected two. The first is from M. Louis Loucheur, former Minister of the Liberated Regions, who seems destined to reach the premiership of France in some not distant future.

Although he did not in the beginning advocate the occupation of the Ruhr, M. Loucheur defends his government's position and deplores the obstacles that the Germans raised against themselves:

"With the single exception of Dr. Rathenau, I have never met a man actually determined to keep Germany's promises or to show the slightest willingness to comply with Germany's obligations. . . . Had a well meaning and energetic man arisen in Germany and said: 'I, too, wish to settle the status of my country towards France once and for all; I want to expend all possible efforts to discharge Germany's obligations,' the Allies would certainly not have failed to evince a similar conciliatory disposition, because all of us are desirous of seeing Peace firmly established in the world."

M. Maurice Schwob, Editor of one of the leading newspapers of Brittany, offers the suggestion that since the Ruhr and the Rhine are a continual bone of contention, the only solution of the problem is that the Rhineland should be set up as an independent neutralized province:

"Let us bring the United States of America to understand that the Rhine provinces are the center around which the United States of Europe will crystallize. . . . Let us upset at one blow all the charges of militarism and imperialism. We *hold* the Rhine provinces, and all we wish to do is to *free* them. We *have* the most powerful army in the world, and all we seek to do is to *disband* it. Our only object is to kill Fear, which paralyzes everything. We can only do this by suppressing every cause of fear.

"Europe will always go in fear, so long as anybody holds the Rhine and the Ruhr. Let us give this property to a co-operative society. Only by installing the League of Nations in Charlemagne's ancient abode shall we rid the people of the idea of resuscitating his empire.

"Around a free Rhineland and a free Ruhr fraternal conventions will group a free Belgium, a free Switzerland, and a free Holland. Others will follow. Little by little the idea of the United States of the World will gain ground. But the seed must be sown. The land is there. Requisition Westphalia. Let us oppose the radiant reality of a Rhine Peace to Stinnes' efforts to resuscitate the frightful bloody legend of the Rhinegold."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CRUSOE AS AN ECONOMIST*

"ROBINSON CRUSOE" is a famous tale. It contains much philosophy and a fine narrative. As the world goes, more people, especially the young, look for the story and skip the philosophy. Mr. Jackson, who is President of the Federal Community Board in Washington, takes up Crusoe's philosophy and finds in it a possible solution of the modern industrial problem. It is not very clear just why Mr. Jackson spends so much time on the analogy. His real problem,—the object which he has in mind in his work and in this book,—is to suggest a solution of the labor and capital problem.

That is the pith of the volume, and he is definite to an extent not often reached by writers on the subject. His solution, in a word, is that the time has come for us to give up standing on our rights; that the day is past when French or American or other creators of democracies draw up bills of rights; that today we must stand on our duties and draw up bills of duties. Nobody ever sallied forth, as he picturesquely writes, in full armor, with soldiers and warships, to carry out his duties. If each of us did what he considered his duty rather than insist on what he considered his rights, there would be an end of wars and industrial problems. That time has not yet arrived; but it is only fair to insist that we are nearer to it than people were a thousand years ago.

Mr. Jackson lists the procedure that should be followed by labor and capital. There is no denying its rightness: the establishment of a fair profit, then of a fair return on capital and finally a division of further profits between capital and labor on some proper basis. That is not only a wise view; it is even in force today in many instances. But what Mr. Jackson does not consider is what is to be done with labor's share of the profits, if there are no profits. Something like ninety per cent of the industrial corporations in the United States do not pay dividends; that is, nearly all businesses fail to make any return on the capital invested. What shall we do with labor and its share in these ninety odd instances out of a hundred?

It would be unfair to the book to ask questions in a review, since the author is not nearby to answer them. It would be unfair, too, to dispute Mr. Jackson on his own ground, unless we, who did so, were better informed than he on the subject, which in this instance is not the case. He is trying to bring about an attitude between human beings, one towards another, that can only be praised and wished God speed in its coming. It comes only as general education advances; and such books help materially

*Robinson Crusoe, Social Engineer, by Henry E. Jackson, E. P. Dutton & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the advancement of this general education. Mr. Jackson's syle is so crisp and direct, his mind is so clear, and his heart so fixed in the right place, that he will interest everyone who will read his book. There is something running along between the lines so constructive and so sincere that you wish to go along with him and try to draw up your own "bill of duties," fight your own "bill of rights."

If we can only arrive at the point where everybody owns something, whether that something be land, or a home, or a share of the stock of the company for which he works, there appears to be little danger of war between labor and capital. Yet unless everybody acquires the habit of "canning" some of his labor each week, each month, each year, there is not much prospect of all of us owning property in the near future. If the farmer buys a Ford or a Victrola when potatoes pay, he becomes a possible creator of war when potatoes fail. If on the other hand he "cans" the profit on his potatoes, he won't fight in a bad year,—at any rate not until he has used up all the labor in the can.

After all, the situation is so much better in Europe and America than it was a hundred years ago that we can take heart. At the time of the outbreak of the Great War it was said that only 400,000 people owned investments in the United States of a kind which could be cut into coupons each six months and these small portions turned into cash. After the sale of the Liberty Bonds this small group had jumped to 22,000,000. Some of these last will slide back, but hundreds and hundreds of thousands of them have learned the value of investments, have canned some of their labor. It is a huge step in advance.

It would seem to some of us, therefore, that our chief duty is to persuade the 105,000,000 men, women, and children in our land to put by, save, set aside, some of their labor, no matter how small it be, in the form of bonds that produce so-called unearned increment.

Mr. Jackson says profits are a small and not very important part of industry, that the joy of work and of life is the great end. The question is too large for a book review. Perhaps it is too large for a book. Mr. Jackson's book should be read,—and many other books should be read before anyone makes up his mind. Even then, there will be much left to learn before it will be safe to make generalizations. Meantime "Robinson Crusoe, Social Engineer" is full of suggestions and interest to experts and neophytes alike.

LUCAS LEXOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED